The Christian Century

Published Weekly

The Pope's Encyclical

An Editorial

LIBRARY
NOV 9 1939
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

A Pacifist Minister to His Brethren

By John Haynes Holmes

How My Mind Has Changed

Concluding Article in the Series

By Charles Clayton Morrison

If Repeal Wins

An Editorial

15 Cents a Copy • November 8, 1939 • Four Dollars a Year

In This Issue

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON

editor of The Christian Century, with the article in this issue brings to a close one of the most important and widely discussed features to be published in this paper in recent years. In all, thirty-five leaders of Christian thought have contributed to this discussion of "How My Mind Has Changed in This Decade."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

is minister of the Community Church, New York, and has contributed many articles, including the famous "The Unknown Soldier Speaks," to Armistice Day numbers of The Christian Century. During the First World War Dr. Holmes unflinchingly maintained his pacifist position as a Christian minister.

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON

is minister of the First Methodist Church, Johnstown, Pa.

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

is Hoober professor of comparative religion, Yale University.

MAX A. KAPP

is minister of the Universalist Church, Rochester, N. Y.

Coming

A second installment of the "Leaves from the Diary of a War-Bound American," by Reinhold Niebuhr, will appear next week. . . . In its issue of November 22 The Christian Century will begin publication of "Preachers Present Arms" by Ray H. Abrams.

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

November 8, 1939

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON, *Editor*
PAUL HUTCHINSON, *Managing Editor*
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON, *Literary Editor*

Staff Correspondents

EDWARD SHILLITO (London)
J. HENRY CARPENTER (New York)
STANLEY A. HUNTER (San Francisco)
T. T. BRUMBAUGH (Tokyo)
R. H. MARKHAM (Budapest)
RAY FREEMAN JENNEY (Syracuse)
ALLAN A. HUNTER (Los Angeles)
JOHN RAY EWERS (Pittsburgh)
ERNEST THOMAS (Toronto)
CHARLES T. HOLMAN (Chicago)
JOSEPH MARTIN DAWSON (Waco)
E. GUERON (Istanbul)
DEVERE ALLEN (Brussels)
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, JR. (Tampa)
EDGAR DEWITT JONES (Detroit)
E. TALLMADGE ROOT (Boston)
W. S. ABERNETHY (Washington)
G. MERRILL LENOX (Minneapolis)
C. G. HAMILTON (Aberdeen, Miss.)
RAYMOND B. WALKER (Portland, Ore.)
P. OOMMAN PHILIP (Nagpur)
C. D. BRODHEAD (Philadelphia)
EDWARD MOWBRAY TATE (Bangkok)
CLARENCE W. KEMPER (Denver)
F. W. BURNHAM (Richmond)
J. D. MONTGOMERY (Buenos Aires)
JOSEPH C. CLEVELAND (Kansas City)
JOHN S. CHADWICK (Birmingham)
J. H. MARION, JR. (Durham, N.C.)
WARREN C. TAYLOR (Des Moines)
A. D. MILLER (Edmonton)
ERNEST M. HOWSE (Winnipeg)
O. M. WALTON (Cleveland)
WM. H. HUDNUT, JR. (Cincinnati)
G. P. MCLEOD (Vancouver)
GEORGE L. CUTTON (Albany)
RALPH V. CONARD (Seattle)
GEORGE W. BUCKNER, JR. (Indianapolis)

$4.00 a year. Canadian postage, 52 cents extra; foreign postage, $1.56 extra

Entered as second-class matter February 28, 1902, at Chicago, Ill., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Copyrighted 1939 in the United States. All rights reserved.
Published weekly by the Christian Century Press, 440 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Christian Century is indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* to be found in all libraries

Contents

Editorial
- Editorial Paragraphs 1363
- The Pope's Encyclical 1366
- If Repeal Wins 1367

Quintus Quiz: The Mob 1369

Contributed Articles
- How My Mind Has Changed, by Charles Clayton Morrison 1370
- A Pacifist Minister to His Brethren, by John Haynes Holmes 1374
- Sight-Seeing, by William K. Anderson 1377

Books
- Religion in Primitive Society, by W. D. Wallis 1378
- After This, by Ryland Kent 1378
- Books in Brief 1379
- Books Received 1379

Correspondence 1380

News of the Christian World
- Correspondence from Chicago 1383
- Correspondence from New York 1383
- International Convention of Disciples 1384
- Correspondence from England 1386
- Correspondence from Ontario 1387
- Correspondence from Detroit 1388
- Universalist General Convention 1389

The New Films 1390

Calendar of Coming Events

Nov. 5-11. American Education Week.
Nov. 5-12. University of Texas Disciples Mission, Austin.
Nov. 8. Northern Baptist Convocation, Cheyenne, Wyo.
Nov. 8-10. North Carolina Disciples State Convention, Dunn.
Nov. 9. Northern Baptist Convocation, Denver, Col.
Nov. 9. Alleghany Conference, Central Pennsylvania Lutheran Synod, Johnstown.
Nov. 10. Northern Baptist Convocation, Pueblo, Col.
Nov. 10-12. Interdenominational Congress on Democracy, Southern College, Lakeland, Fla.
Nov. 10-13. International Goodwill Congress, Milwaukee, Wis.
Nov. 12. Sunday Evening Forum, First Congregational Church, Oak Park, Ill.; Norman Thomas, speaker.
Nov. 12. Ford Hall Forum, Boston; Ernest Dimnet, speaker.
Nov. 12. Chicago Sunday Evening Club; Edgar DeWitt Jones, speaker.
Nov. 13. Northern Baptist Convocation, Hastings, Neb.
Nov. 13, 14. Massachusetts Council of Churches, Lowell.
Nov. 13. West Pennsylvania Conference, Central Pennsylvania Lutheran Synod, Hanover.
Nov. 14. Northern Baptist Convocation, Omaha, Neb.
Nov. 14, 15. Sixth Annual Conference, Kentucky-Tennessee Lutheran Synod, Louisville, Ky.
Nov. 14-16. Baptist State Convention, Augusta, Ga.
Nov. 14-17. Baptist State Convention, San Antonio, Tex.
Nov. 15. Northern Baptist Convocation, Sioux City, Ia.
Nov. 15, 16. Baptist State Convention, Greenville, S. C.
Nov. 16. Northern Baptist Convocation, Des Moines, Ia.
Nov. 17. Northern Baptist Convocation, Davenport, Ia.
Nov. 17, 18. Child Study Association of America Institute, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City.
Nov. 19. Ford Hall Forum, Boston; Herbert Agar, speaker.
Nov. 19. Chicago Sunday Evening Club; Richard C. Raines, speaker.
Nov. 19. Sunday Evening Forum, First Congregational Church, Oak Park, Ill.; Albert W. Palmer, speaker.
Nov. 26. Chicago Sunday Evening Club; James E. Freeman, speaker.
Nov. 26. Sunday Evening Forum, First Congregational Church, Oak Park, Ill.; Klaus Mann, speaker.
Nov. 26. Ford Hall Forum, Boston; Moritz J. Bonn, speaker.
Nov. 28. Annual Meeting, Pennsylvania Council of Churches, Harrisburg.
Dec. 1-3. Michigan Young People's Convention, Detroit.
Dec. 8, 9. Southern Area Council, Y.M.C.A., Atlanta, Ga.
Dec. 16. Second Annual Student Conference, New York University, New York City.
Dec. 28-Jan. 1. Triennial Conference, Church Workers in Universities, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Jan. 16-18. Annual Midwinter Convocation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Edwin McNeill Poteat, speaker.

(Announcements will be printed in this calendar as received, but must reach the editorial office at least three weeks in advance of the date mentioned.)

The
CHRISTIAN CENTURY
Undenominational

VOLUME LVI CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 8, 1939 NUMBER 45

EDITORIAL

OPINION generally will hold that the most important development in the war last week, so far as the future is concerned, was the vote in the American Senate to lift the arms embargo. It may turn out, however, that the most portentous events of the week concerned India. In India itself, Congress (nationalist) cabinets in the major provinces of Madras and the United Provinces resigned, and the other six Congress provincial governments seem certain to follow their example. The next step promises to be another vast non-cooperation movement. While steadfastly opposing resort to violence, Mahatma Gandhi is as outspoken in his condemnation of British policy as Nehru or any of the other nationalists. At the same time, Sir Samuel Hoare has made a statement to Parliament which can only be interpreted as a threat to impose military repression on India if non-cooperation is proclaimed. Sir Samuel had one unfortunate excursion into matters of imperial policy when he joined with Pierre Laval to offer Mussolini most of Ethiopia on a golden platter. His threatening speech on India may turn out to have been an even greater blunder. Certainly it will do nothing to convince the Indian nationalists that this is a war for freedom or democracy. Incidentally, it is becoming glaringly apparent that the American press is getting next to no news direct from India. All that is printed in this country on that vitally important part of the world either comes from British sources or passes through British channels. Whether this is the fault of the government of India or of the American press we do not know. But it is a fact always to be borne in mind.

The War

Britain Approves Russia's Polish Grab

GREAT SIGNIFICANCE attaches to the statement which Lord Halifax, the British foreign secretary, made to Parliament on October 26. After the Earl of Listowel had informed the House of Lords that Great Britain had given Poland no guarantees against Russian aggression, Lord Halifax not only endorsed that now familiar argument but went on to excuse the soviet grab on the ground, first, that Russia was merely following a bad example set by Germany, and second, that the Russian occupation sets the new boundaries of the U.S.S.R. at the line recommended to the Versailles treaty-makers by Lord Curzon. In addition, the foreign secretary gave assurances that Great Britain stands firm in her determination to maintain friendly relations with Russia. It is surprising to find a statesman whose ethical sensitivity has been as widely celebrated as that of Lord Halifax engaged in thus trying to justify such a course as Russia has followed in eastern Poland on the ground that somebody else did wrong first. No one will blame the Allies for not wanting to include Russia in the number of their enemies, and pretty nearly any excuse to get out of a war over the Russian grab should be regarded as a good excuse. But of all the available excuses, Lord Halifax surely chose the weakest. However, the implication of the total statement was unmistakable. It means that Great Britain acquiesces in the Russian annexation of more than a third of Poland. And it proves beyond a shadow of doubt that when the Allies say they are fighting for justice to Poland they do not mean that they are fighting to restore the Poland that was on September 1.

United Church Rebukes Pacifist Pastors

CHURCHES in nations at war still march to the beat of the government's drum. This is the conclusion which must be drawn from the action of the United Church of Canada in rushing forward to rebuke certain of its clergy who had signed a statement affirming their pacifism. The most important portions of that statement were printed in these pages last week. As was to have been expected, patriotic ire was aroused in many quarters by the action of the pacifist clergymen, and now the United Church has hastened to take measures to wash its hands of all responsibility for harboring such sentiments. In a long statement issued by the sub-executive of the general council of the United Church, an effort is first made to minimize the importance of the pacifist manifesto and to prove that the church as a whole is zealously supporting

the war. Then follows this passage: "We are therefore confident that we but express the attitude for the United Church of Canada as a whole when we declare our regret at the action of the signatories in making their manifesto public. The church is determined to adhere to its previous declarations that it will protect the individual conscience but, in our judgment, by acting collectively and inviting signatures 'for later publication' the signatories of this manifesto, however sincere, have gone far beyond the limits of what is wise and proper in time of war. Even the appearance of organizing opinion against the tragic necessities of the community cannot but jeopardize the essential unity and fellowship both of the church and of the nation. The sub-executive would take this opportunity of proclaiming afresh the entire and unfailing loyalty of the United Church of Canada to his majesty the king and its steady purpose to support him in the present dire struggle in every way which is open and proper to the church." We venture a prophecy: when the history of the relation of the Christian church to this war is written, this document from the United Church of Canada will be given a chapter all to itself. Well it may, for every sentence is pregnant with meaning, big with destiny—a sorrowful destiny for the church.

Roman Catholic Aggression On Public School Funds

ROMAN CATHOLICS are making progress, a step at a time, in their century-long campaign to secure public funds for parochial schools. The latest case is in New York. Fuller information concerning the incident mentioned in the issue of October 25 (page 1316) shows that under the constitutional provision adopted in 1938, a law of May 16, 1939, and a state department of education ruling dated July 28, 1939, the following state of facts is possible: (a) School District Number 11, Southampton, N. Y., has adequate school facilities for all the children within its boundaries. (b) It does not now provide, and never has provided, bus transportation for children to the public school. (c) On request that it provide transportation at public expense for Catholic children to a Catholic school seven miles away, in Center Moriches, the town meeting voted 97 to 4 against the proposal. (d) Nevertheless, under a trick interpretation of a trick clause in the law, the district is ordered to provide such transportation, although to do so will require either the elimination of some of the work in the public school or the levying of additional taxes. This all started a few years ago when a measure authorizing school buses to pick up parochial school pupils who were going their way, if there was room for them, was vetoed by Governor Lehman. A similar, but still guarded, measure was passed and signed but was invalidated by the New York supreme court in 1938—while the constitutional convention was in session. Former Governor Alfred E. Smith, who had introduced in the constitutional convention of 1915 a proposal to appropriate public money for sectarian schools, joined with others in securing the inclusion of the bus provision in the 1938 constitution. It required districts which furnish transportation to public schools to furnish it also to private schools. How they get over from this to the proposition that it must be furnished to a parochial school outside of the district, and not even in a contiguous district, when it is not furnished to the public school, is something of a mystery. Perhaps there is a legal bridge. Certainly the camel's nose has slipped a little farther into the tent.

Another Sample of the Dies Committee's Tactics

FAIR-MINDED Americans will agree with President Roosevelt that the latest performance of the Dies committee, in releasing to the press a list of 563 federal employees as part of a communist bloc in Washington, was a "sordid procedure." It was worse than that; it was dirty politics. In sending out the list Congressman Dies and those of his associates who voted to approve his action were deliberately trying to mislead the American people and smear the administration. Careful reading of the release from the Dies committee will show that the 563 names given out included not only members of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy but also persons whose names happened to be on the league's mailing list. Mr. Dies and his associates, however, were relying on the fact that few Americans would read beyond the headlines and that few newspapers would use headlines making clear the fact that this was, at least in part, nothing more than a mailing list. We do not doubt that some readers of this paragraph will find out here for the first time that the Dies committee did not really assert that all the government employees it named were members of the alleged "communist front" organization. Several months ago, when the Dies committee was reorganized, it was promised that henceforth it would conduct its hearings in accord with established congressional precedent and elementary rules of fair play. At times since then it has appeared that it might render a genuine patriotic service in uncovering sources of alien mischief-making in the nation. Such a "sordid procedure" as this, however, destroys the whole basis for confidence in the committee's good faith. Investigation of un-American activities had better be left to the department of justice, where it belonged in the first place.

Religious Statisticians Want Census Questions on Belief

SEVERAL weeks ago (August 23) The Christian Century commented on a protest from certain zealous Protestant champions of religious liberty against the supposed plan of the census bureau to introduce questions about religious affiliation into the census questionnaire, and reported that the bureau had no such plan, at the same time saying that it seemed a good idea. The association of statisticians of American religious bodies has now made a formal petition to the census bureau asking it to include the following questions: "Do you believe in God? Are you affiliated with any religious group? To what religious group do you claim allegiance?" The figures hitherto published by the government as a re-

ligious census (as of 1906, 1916 and 1926) have been compilations of statistics furnished by Protestant ministers and the chancery offices of Catholic dioceses. The inaccuracy of these figures is acknowledged and notorious. Certainly a more accurate statement could be made on the basis of answers to questions put to individuals by the census enumerators. But would the asking of such questions be an infringement of religious liberty? We cannot see how it would be. In the first place, it does not seem that the right to be a secret member of a communion is a kind of religious liberty for which anyone would be willing to fight, bleed and die. In the second place, any ardent Methodist or Baptist who cherishes the privilege of concealing his membership from the census taker and keeping himself out of the totals can exercise that privilege. There is no way of compelling him to answer the question even if it is asked, and it is not to be supposed that the government will devise methods of applying penalties to any who are not disposed to testify as to the faith that is in them. As to the question about belief in God, the only objection is that the answers, when compiled into statistical summaries, will not mean much. The content of the conception of God is so different to different minds, and the implications of belief are so various, that it will be difficult to draw any valid conclusions from the figures, whatever they may be.

Congress Aroused by Movie Satire

HOLLYWOOD has become as anxious as President Roosevelt to see Congress adjourn the moment action is completed on the neutrality bill. But for a different reason. Hollywood's reason is that the Neely bill, outlawing block-booking and blind-selling, waits only approval by the House to become law, and in its present mood the House would be almost sure to vote its approval. In plain words, Congress is bubbling over with wrath at the movies, and while anger burns the Hays office trembles. You see it's this way: Frank Capra, who is frequently acclaimed as Hollywood's finest director, has just completed a film, "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington." The film deals with the trials of a new senator, and lavish advance publicity has stressed the fidelity with which the operations of the Senate have been reproduced. Someone in Hollywood had the bright idea of pre-viewing the film at the National Press Club in Washington, with all members of Congress as invited guests. Boundless free advertising beckoned, and the advance Washington showing was accordingly held. From what we hear, the film turned out to be fully up to Capra standards from a dramatic standpoint, but in its depiction of the Senate and of the Washington corps of newspaper correspondents it went sadly astray. Senators are shown as so deeply involved in graft and political knavery that when the young senator fights for decency he is sent to Coventry. Newspaper correspondents are pictured as barflies, perpetually awash in liquor. Or so we hear. The impression of the United States government, given to moviegoers both at home and abroad, will be, to say the least, unfortunate. And Congress is mad. So, for that matter, are the Washington representatives of the press. Hence, Hollywood's fear that someone may call up the Neely bill while the special session continues, and its further fear that if the bill is not adopted now it will be when the regular session opens in January. We wish that Congress would pass this needed bill for better reasons than to appease its wrath. But if the bill is passed now, it will be only another instance of the ability of Hollywood to bring retribution upon itself.

Liberals Win Decisive Victory in Quebec

AS premier of Quebec, reactionary Maurice Duplessis had a spectacular political rise and seemed to many to hold an unshakable position. But his position was not only shaken but completely destroyed by his overwhelming defeat in the recent Quebec election. The issue upon which he laid emphasis in the campaign was the participation of Quebec in the war, to which he was opposed on the ground that the action of the dominion government was an infringement of Quebec's autonomy. The election was an emphatic repudiation of that view. But it was more than that. It was a repudiation of a leadership which had taken the illiberal side on every issue and had tried to cloak its illiberalism by an appeal to the racial pride of the French element and to give it a religious sanction by maintaining a close working agreement with the Roman Catholic hierarchy and especially with Cardinal Villeneuve. The "padlock law," ostensibly designed to check communism (which Duplessis and his allies not only failed but refused to define), became a means of invoking the power of the police against any critic of his administration. The labor laws adopted under his regime were distinctly hostile to organized labor. Civil liberties were constantly endangered by his quasi-fascist policies. Ernest Lapointe, minister of justice in the dominion cabinet and himself a Quebec man, had described Duplessis as a "gangster" whose appeal to racial prejudice had no other purpose than to keep himself in power and had promised, as had the two other Quebec members of the dominion cabinet, to resign if Duplessis were not defeated at the polls. At times during the past two or three years the situation in Quebec has been the darkest on the continent as regards civil liberties and the functioning of the democratic process, but it is evident now that the chief fault lay not with the attitudes of the people but with their leadership. The fall of Duplessis means the rise of Quebec in the esteem of its neighbors on both sides of the line.

Moderate Drinkers Cause Automobile Deaths

SO we are all wrong when we say that liquor is responsible for a large part of the highway massacre in this country, are we? Well, the National Safety Council at its convention in Atlantic City last month received the report of a special committee which has been making a three-year study of this subject. And the report stated that liquor is directly responsible for 25 per cent of the

deaths from motor car accidents. Twenty per cent of all automobile fatalities, the report stated, are caused by drinking drivers; 15 per cent involve drinking pedestrians. Moreover, it is not the drunk who is responsible for most of the killings; it is the slightly irresponsible person with only two or three drinks under his belt. "The main hazard," according to Taylor Soper, executive secretary of the Illinois Road Builders' Association, "is not the souse. There are not many of them. The main hazard is fellows like my friends and yours who think they can drive as well with just a few drinks as they can with no drinks. They are numerous." So far as we know, this is the first time a responsible public body has made a careful investigation of the causes of our ceaseless highway slaughter and allowed the facts to reach the public. We wonder how many of the papers which published these facts, and perhaps editorialized on them, were filled with liquor advertising? And we wonder how many papers filled with liquor advertising failed to publish or comment on these facts? Of course, just knowing the facts will not bring the dead back to life or save the thirty thousand who are doomed to be killed this year. The question, now that the facts are known, is: What's to be done about them? As a starter, why not a drive to make the American Medical Association tests for determining whether a person is under the influence of alcohol legal in every state in the union? (Indiana and Maine are the only states where they are recognized as legal evidence now.) And along with that, laws in every state punishing the driver who is found under liquor's influence with loss of his driving license or his right to operate a car?

The Pope's Encyclical

POPE PIUS XII's first encyclical has one characteristic in common with every other modern encyclical which deals with large questions of public and private morality: it makes a strong Christian appeal, which every Christian must applaud and endorse, for the dominance of spiritual ideals in the world, for recognition of the commands of God, the rule of Christ in the hearts and lives of men, and the rights of conscience as against any mundane authority that would override it. It also makes a strong assertion, which every Protestant or other non-Romanist must repudiate, of the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to be the sole authorized representative of the law of God and of the pope's claim to be the vicar of Christ and the center about which any spiritual revival must be organized.

Non-Catholics have come to take for granted this identification of Christianity with Roman Catholicism in the minds and utterances of popes and other spokesmen for that church. They realize, as a matter of course, that the Roman Catholic Church would not be what it is, and that a pope would not be a fitting occupant of his position, if the gigantic arrogance of such claims were not thus maintained. So they seek to penetrate beneath the shell of this assumption of uniqueness and authority—though indeed it is not a shell but is interwoven with the entire texture of the thought—to find the spiritual reality within.

It would perhaps be impossible for the pope to distinguish between what he thinks as a Catholic and as the supreme head of the church and what he thinks as an individual Christian. But it is, to a degree, possible for a Protestant to make this distinction. It is the pope's message as a Christian that chiefly concerns us. It is a strong message, full of sound truth.

First, he repudiates racialism, which is a denial of the brotherhood of man and the common fatherhood of God. Christianity can make no terms with any social or political philosophy which builds upon a theory of inherent racial superiority in those things which concern the ultimate human values, or which treats racial differences as barriers beyond which the obligations of the moral law do not run. A few days after issuing his encyclical the pope gave impressive demonstration of the church's attitude toward race by consecrating twelve new bishops, including a Hindu, an African native of Uganda, a native of Madagascar, and a Chinese. "Those who enter the church," said the pope, "whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the house of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail." This does not prevent a "legitimate and well ordered love of our native country," the maintenance of its proper traditions, or a reasonable pride in its glory and prosperity.

But the elevation of the state itself into an object of worship, the encyclical continues, the separation of civil authority from all dependence upon God, and its claim of unrestricted liberty of action without regard to moral or divine law, guided only by "the changeful tide of human will, or the dictates of casual historical claims and the interests of a few"—these constitute an error pernicious alike in its effects upon the nation itself and upon that more inclusive society in which all nations and races are embraced.

Avoiding the use of the word "totalitarian" and making no specific mention of any nation or government, the pope clearly described and roundly denounced those secular powers which undertake to dominate by purely political agencies the entire range of human life, to override the rights of the family and the individual, and to make the state itself the end as well as the means of all action. This section was perhaps the chief reason why the encyclical was not read in the Catholic churches in Germany on the Sunday following its release. The restraint which kept the name of Germany out of the text was purely verbal. Germany and Russia were clearly the objects of the papal criticism. Italy had already been for the most part exonerated in an earlier paragraph in which gratification was expressed that the papacy had been restored to its "happy, juridical and spiritual position" by the Lateran accord and the concordat, and that "the peace of Christ restored in Italy, like a new dawn of brotherly union in religious and civil intercourse, had its beginning in these pacts." (But here, of course, the pope speaks as a Catholic, not simply as a Christian.)

A brief paragraph interjected in the denunciation of the totalitarian state repeats the already familiar papal criticism of socialism. This was perhaps intended chiefly

for application to Russia, but it undoubtedly has a wider reference also. "If in fact the state lays claim to and directs private enterprises, these, ruled as they are by delicate and complicated internal principles which guarantee and assure the realization of their special aims, may be damaged to the detriment of the public good, by being wrenched from their natural surroundings, that is, from responsible private action." Sturdy individualists will doubtless be grateful for the influence of the pope on their side, but they may be excused for wishing that he might have supported their cause by some more convincing argument than a reference to the guaranteed realization of the aims of business when it is left to its own internal principles and the unrestricted control of individual owners.

Because the state can command the bodies but not the souls of its citizens, it cannot rightfully enforce upon the young a system of education which secularizes their minds as the godless state is itself secularized.

Coming to international affairs—the theme which doubtless loomed largest upon his horizon as he spoke—the pope asserted that only by basing the state upon Christian principles can there be international amity and peace. That is to say, nations must recognize the limitations of their powers by the law of God. They may not oppress the weak, or disappoint "the expectation and conviction that each party [to a treaty] will respect its word." They must use reason rather than force and conference rather than war. This they will do if they are Christian. This they will not do if, ignoring the commands of God and the law of Christ, they make the will of each state the supreme power and the immediate interests of each state the ultimate goal.

In order that states may be truly Christian and that the family of nations may live in peace and harmony, "the re-education of mankind must be, above all things, spiritual and religious." From this important point, the argument passes naturally to an exaltation of the function of the church as the teacher and mother of men. Elsewhere, and especially in his address at the consecration of the twelve bishops a few days later, the pope called for a united front of all Christians, including the separated brethren, against the tide of godlessness which threatens to engulf the world in disaster. Early in the encyclical itself he gratefully acknowledges the expressions of good will he has received from those of other faiths and "their appreciation of all that united them to us in love for the person of Christ or in belief in God." But obviously and naturally, when he thinks of the spiritual and religious re-education of mankind he is thinking of it as a responsibility to be borne by the Roman Catholic Church, and when he refers to unity in this connection it is to say that it is "the hope of so many noble minds separated from us, who yet in their hunger and thirst for justice and peace turn their eyes to the see of Peter and from it await guidance and counsel."

In so far as the pope speaks as a Christian, reminding governments and men that all power is from God and that there are principles of righteousness which neither individuals nor states may ignore except at their peril, he speaks the eternal truth. To be sure, he says this no more clearly than it has been said many times before. Those who "turn their eyes to the see of Peter" and await guidance and counsel from it, receive on these points excellent guidance and wise counsel, but no better than are available in a thousand other places. The teaching is excellent, but not unique. The pope knows nothing of these matters that the humblest Christian does not know.

When he calls men to give allegiance to Christ the King, he does what every priest and every preacher does every Sunday—or should do. But it is relevant to remember in this connection that the claim of the Bishop of Rome to speak with unique authority for God and to be in a unique sense the Vicar of Christ is one reason why the nations have ceased to admit—or to act upon the principle if they do admit it—that Christ is King, that all power comes from God, and that human law is limited by divine law.

If Repeal Wins

AFTER almost a month of debate the Senate approved the Pittman resolution amending the neutrality law by a vote of 63 to 30. In the closing hours of the debate efforts were made to tighten the provisions of the administration bill in several ways, notably by setting up a quota control over all exports in order to guard against a war boom in materials other than munitions and by forbidding the export of flame throwers and poison gas. But the senators supporting President Roosevelt closed ranks and defeated all such amendments. The Pittman resolution, accordingly, has gone to the House, where in some way it will be substituted for the Bloom bill, which that body passed last spring.

Exactly how the House will deal with the measure is not known as this is written. But it is likely that action will be swift. The vote, according to present forecasts, will be close. It is possible that it may reverse the Senate decision. However, the chances are that before this can be read the neutrality law will have been amended in accordance with the President's wishes. The arms embargo will have been lifted; all trade with belligerents will be on a cash-and-carry basis. In the light of this probability, what should be American policy? If the arms embargo is repealed, where do the American people, with their desire to stay out of the war, go from here?

Many Americans, whose devotion to peace cannot be questioned, will deny that any danger of involvement in the war lurks in the repeal of the embargo. They have asserted that it will prove possible to devote this nation's resources to the service of one side without ourselves being drawn in on that side. To all such citizens, accordingly, passage of the repeal will seem of no great importance—an incident not likely to have a major effect on the future of the United States. We cannot dismiss the prospect thus lightly. We believe that if repeal is adopted the chances of American involvement in the war will be greatly increased, and that only the most ceaseless and single-minded vigilance will suffice to keep this nation out. Nor are we convinced that those who have been foremost in

pressing for repeal will be either ceaseless or single-minded in the future struggle to keep the United States at peace. As to this, time will tell.

Four major reasons have underlain the opposition of The Christian Century to repeal of the arms embargo. First, there has been fear of the effect on the national economy of the overexpansion of a munitions industry and of a boom in supplying supplementary war materials. This danger was pointed out in the editorial, "Keep the Arms Embargo," of September 20. Second, there has been fear of the psychological effect, both on the administration and on the public mind, of casting aside any of the provisions enacted in time of peace to protect the nation's neutrality in time of war. Reading what happened a quarter-century ago makes it clear that the United States did not so much enter the First World War as slip into it. We fear that repeal may start a psychological slipping process. Third, there has been recognition that adoption of the administration's program constituted an official choice of sides in the war. Taking sides is not the same thing as staying out, and no sophistry can make it so. Fourth, there has been the knowledge that the administration's bill would place the entire war-making resources of the United States at the disposal of Japan. As passed by the Senate, the cash-and-carry provisions have been so weakened as even to provide American ships to transport American munitions to Japan's armies in China. This may seem a minor matter at the moment. Certainly the peace advocates who have supported repeal have ignored it. But it will come back to haunt the American conscience, just as will the President's refusal to apply the neutrality law from the first moment of the Japanese invasion of China.

In a radio address on October 26 President Roosevelt told the nation: "In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogey man. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any state government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake."

We welcome this, as the President intended it should be welcomed, as personal assurance from him that repeal of the arms embargo will not lead to American participation in Europe's war. We shall set these words aside for future reference, and if the event proves the President to have been right, we shall be quick so to acknowledge. In the meantime, however, we must insist that the President and those members of the Congress who vote for the embargo repeal have incurred as grave a responsibility as men ever shouldered. They have, in effect, given their personal pledge of honor that enactment of the administration measure will not open the road to war. It is profoundly to be hoped that, in their inmost thinking, they do not dismiss the dangers of their decision with an airy sneer about an "imaginary bogey." That the bogey is not imaginary is suggested by the administration's announcement of immediate need for expansion of the army and additional funds for the already unprecedented naval building appropriation.

It is true that to most Americans it now seems impossible that the United States might become involved in Europe's war. But if the war continues and grows in destructive force, there will be set in operation against American neutrality potent influences which can by no means be laughed away as imaginary bogeys. There will be, first of all, the force of the war boom. Under cash-and-carry, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, the Allies can mobilize at least $7,000,000,000 for purchases in this country. Already the nation is responding to the stimulus of a boomlet which consists largely in the expectation of huge Allied war orders to come. Seven billion dollars means a boom; it cannot be escaped. After the boom will come the necessity to keep the boom going. Especially until after the 1940 election. How? As long as cash lasts, with cash. When cash runs out, the boom must be kept going anyway. That will require credit. Credit must be sustained. What will that mean in the hour when, because of military reverses or for other reasons, our debtors' credit is no longer good?

Nor will the drive against American desire to stay out of the war be principally of this crass materialistic nature. After the cash-and-carry boom gets well under way there will be loosed—if ever the Allies run into real difficulties—a moral indignation drive which will prove infinitely harder to resist. "By what moral right do these Americans sit safely at home piling up profits wrung from our agony while we fight the battle of freedom for them?" That, with endless variations, will be the cry. It will be a cry which will prove more potent than the urge to keep industry at a boom level. Taken together, these two forces—the material and the moral—may easily prove far from an "imaginary bogey."

How can the nation protect its peace against the assault which may thus be loosed if the embargo is scrapped in favor of a cash-and-carry war policy? Two lines of action clearly are required. For one thing, the nation as a whole needs to be made vividly aware that it still does not know what the Allies are fighting for. To seek to uncover actual war aims is preeminently the task of Congress and the press, yet in it the pulpit may bear an important part. It can at least help to make clear to the American public the vital limitations of its knowledge.

We doubt whether the public has as yet generally awakened to the significance of the statement reported here last week by Alfred Duff Cooper, first of the major British propagandists to land on these shores. Former first lord of the admiralty and interior to the plans of the party now ruling England, Mr. Duff Cooper signalized his arrival in New York by telling of Britain's expectation of a monarchist revolution in Germany, to set up a Catholic empire in central Europe under the probable rule of the Archduke Otto, the Hapsburg Austrian pretender. Further reports from England indicate that Mr. Duff Cooper's interview must be regarded as another

example of that familiar diplomatic device, the "calculated indiscretion," and that the intrigue to set up a new Catholic monarchy over the area roughly included between Cologne, Munich, Vienna and Warsaw is well advanced. So, at least, testifies the *Week,* radical political journal of London. The American press has been reprehensibly remiss in failing to bring home to the public the enormous importance of the Duff Cooper interview and its bearing on the question of war aims. Having fought one war to get rid of a Kaiser, are the Allies now fighting another to bring a Kaiser back? And having persuaded the people of the United States that the first was "our war," can they persuade them that the second is "our war" likewise?

Here, then, is the first thing which must be done to protect this nation from any evil effects of lifting the embargo—there must be a demand for an official and complete definition of Allied war aims which is not relaxed until it is satisfied. Along with it must go a second effort. There must be ceaseless reinforcement of the nation's will to peace. It is at this point that the Christian ministry confronts its gravest responsibility. The nation's universal desire for peace must be forged into an equally universal will to peace. For as has been said in these columns many times, this is at bottom a matter not of legislation but of will. No neutrality law however strong could have kept the United States out of this war if the American people had willed to go in. No law however weak can betray the United States into the war if the American people will to stay out. The pulpit operates directly and all the time on the national will. And the return of this poignant Armistice Day—Futility Day, as someone has well renamed it—affords a providential opportunity to launch the effort to make the national will an unbending will to peace.

The Mob

Editor The Christian Century:

SIR: It is many years now since I had my only real sight of a mob. I have been in mobs since then many times, but you never see a mob until you are over against it. Until you are the object of its attention, or possibly its anger; until you look upon a sea of faces intent upon one passionate end; until you are the enemy!

I was not on that occasion the Enemy Number 1, but I was his friend, and I was with him. He held an unpopular view, which made him an ogre in the town where we lived. I knew that he was likely to be at home to a large number of his fellow citizens—and I went to stay with him.

It was a large and angry crowd which assembled to do justice to a righteous cause by mobbing the villain. Only by the aid of all the forces of law and order in the town were they restrained; I remember how effective the hose of the fire brigade was. They did find expression by breaking the windows of the house as well as by the use of invective, but no harm was done to us. But not till long after midnight was there silence in that very respectable town.

I have never forgotten what a mob is like when it is seen from without. One lesser characteristic is its lack of humor when it is angry. There are merry mobs, in which wit kindles wit. But I doubt whether there was much humor in the historic mob at Ephesus which cried, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" When the mob which I saw shouted loudly to my friend, "Come out, you coward!" they were expressing, it is true, a fervent desire to deal with him drastically, but since they were a thousand or more and he was one it was difficult to know why he should be called a coward.

But far more serious in the mob is the lack of individual responsibility which its members show. When thinkers try to discover the marks of a human life which is Christian, they rightly single out as one of them a sense of responsibility. The members of a mob cast off that sense and the result is that it has a curious subhuman quality. It has a certain unity of its own, but it is unity on a level below the lowest reached by any member of that crowd. Or perhaps as the mob gives occasion for the release of furies and desires which are commonly kept in restraint in the individual life. The censor, of whom psychology teaches, is given a holiday and the unconscious is free.

It is a curious blend of credulity and wrath that may be found when men and women are in crowds. A mob will believe anything when once its primitive emotions are roused. There are some who believe that a modern educated crowd would be less credulous than an ancient mob in Babylon or Jerusalem. Frankly, I do not believe that there is any change in the mob in this respect. An anti-Semite mob today is given and receives precisely the same foolish slanders as were used in the Middle Ages against the same people.

Yet it must not be forgotten that however wicked the prompters may be, they would not succeed as well as they do but for their appeal to a capacity for indignation which is not without its good side. The members of a mob have lies dealt out to them; they are the victims of primitive desires and passions; they are cruel and irresponsible, but there is something else.

One confirmation of Scripture memory brings back to me. You will not have forgotten that the mob in Ephesus cried out "about the space of two hours, Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" I used to think that "two hours" was rather longer than was likely; but I did not doubt after seeing a mob, noting its power of sustained repetition of its slogans, that the author of the Acts was strictly correct. And right, too, in the record that they kept on saying the same thing. This, I believe, is a mark of certain forms of mental derangement (from which there are many who suffer), and certainly a mob is a fitting subject for the analysis of those who minister to minds diseased.

You will say, "Yes, but Quintus, there is another side of the mob." I agree wholeheartedly; I rejoice in crowds; I hate all barbarians who want to separate themselves in their choice haunts from the vulgar crowd. Still I think I shall keep the word "mob" for use when we become "the lewd fellows of the baser sort."

Ever yours,

Quintus Quiz.

How My Mind Has Changed

By Charles Clayton Morrison

IN ADDING my testimony to the series which has been appearing in The Christian Century during the past ten months, I am yielding to repeated suggestions which have been made by many friends and correspondents. In view of the willingness of thirty-four others to testify, at my request, concerning their intellectual experience it seems only fair that I take my part before the meeting closes. I shall put to myself the same question which I put to them and shall try to be as candid as they have been.

The change which has come about in my thinking cannot be described as a shift from one position to another, a conversion to something which I did not formerly believe, or the abandonment of something which I formerly held true. Instead, I can only describe it as a flowing together of two streams of loyalty which, for many years, had been flowing in separate channels. The confluence of these two streams has produced what, if I may so dignify the result, seems to me like a new "emergent" in my thinking, something different from its component streams, yet containing them.

I

One of these streams is my continuing sense of having received a heritage, something that has been *given* to me, which has the right to command my loyalty, and that not merely because it was given to me but because it is inherently true and infinitely precious. This is my heritage in the Christian faith, which I have variously conceived as the truth of the gospel, the revelation of God in Christ, the Christian tradition, and latterly as the historical community of the faith, namely, the Christian church itself which comprehends all the rest. I have never conceived myself, in even my most perplexed and critical moods, standing outside this stream of my Christian inheritance, regretting that I was born within it, or hoping some day to grow out of it, or imagining without pain a world in which it should no longer exist. My most controlling instinct has been to arise to its defense when it was assailed, to win others to an understanding of and a participation in the grace and power which it carries, and to strengthen the faith and loyalty of those who waver. I have never envisaged any other way of salvation for myself or my fellows or the great world of humanity wrenched with competitive strife and tearing itself to pieces in demonic war, than the way which has been opened up by Christ and his gospel.

The other stream, which has run parallel with this unwavering loyalty to the Christian inheritance, may be designated as my commitment to an empirical way of thinking. In college, I had become fascinated with philosophy, psychology and ethics. (I read most of Kant's two *Critiques* while still an undergraduate—with what degree of understanding the reader may guess!) When, after a four-year pastorate in Chicago, I resigned to accept a fellowship in the University of Chicago it was not to enter the divinity school, but the department of philosophy and psychology. Yet I had no other thought than that of continuing in the Christian ministry. My decision was determined by the belief that the basic problems of theology arise first as problems in philosophy and are resolved ultimately by philosophical considerations. I no longer hold this belief in the form in which I held it then, and its modification marks one of the important changes which my thought has experienced in the past ten years.

Three years in philosophy at the University of Chicago in the very heyday of the then new school of "radical empiricism" which had emerged under the guiding mind of John Dewey, fully established me in the empirical way of thinking. Besides Dewey (whose last three years at Chicago before going to Columbia were my three years), my teachers were mainly G. H. Mead, J. H. Tufts, J. R. Angell and E. S. Ames. When I left, I was thoroughly immunized against every form of rationalism, apriorism, or speculation of any kind based upon dogmatic or authoritarian ideas. Ideas, I saw, arise in experience, they are conditioned by experience, they refer to experience—whether to the concrete experience out of which they have arisen or to a possible experience toward which they point. In a word, ideas are functional for experience.

Obviously, this stream of empirical thinking to which, for better or for worse, I was committed long ago, would have difficulty in flowing in the same channel with the stream of my loyalty to my Christian heritage. For Christianity seemed to present itself as something from beyond experience—a revelation *to* experience, demanding a loyalty which did not ask to be validated by my ideas and which such empirical ideas as I had could not validate. I could not make a place for *revelation* in my empirical philosophy, nor for my empirical philosophy in my acceptance of a divine revelation. Therefore, I had to maintain two sets of loyalties at once, my loyalty to the Christian faith and my loyalty to a way of thinking which I could not compromise without violating my inner integrity. I could not feel that these two loyalties were, at bottom, mutually contradictory, or irreconcilable—only that I had not yet been able to reconcile them.

II

Meanwhile, I had my work to do. My work was the Christian ministry, in the parish and the editorial office. This, I think, has been my salvation. My native sense of loyalty to something given in my Christian inheritance has been reinforced by my professional responsibility as a mediator of this inheritance to others. Without the constraint of such responsibility, I can easily believe that I might have gone the way of so many who have been indoctrinated with the empirical way of thinking, and landed finally in disillusionment or indifference or, possibly, cynicism, with respect to the Christian religion.

Through all the years I was inwardly trying to open a connecting channel between the two separate streams of

loyalty so that their waters could flow together. I could not take my empirical loyalties over to the Christian stream to be dedicated to something that seemed to transcend experience! But I could carry a particular Christian truth over to the empirical channel and give it a baptism in the waters of psychological experience. I could ask this question: What does this Christian idea mean in terms of experience? Experience was the test of its validity and the measure of its worth. I found myself rather successful in the application of this test. It yielded results with most of the Christian doctrines and values, even with the idea of God and of divine revelation. I was able through the years to find an empirical meaning for virtually the whole circle of Christian verities. This method gave me my sermons, for the most part. I wanted to show others that Christianity was not something remote from life, but that its doctrines, its values and its ideals all arose in the same kind of experiences—needs, attitudes, hopes, interests, values—as those which are common to all men. My acquaintance with psychology helped me greatly here.

There was a genuine satisfaction in this procedure of translating Christianity into terms of psychological experience. It generated an unction of its own. I was relieving people of a burden—the burden of having to believe the historical particularities of Christianity. I was engaged in "simplifying" religion, and surely this was a worthy service. That I was really oversimplifying it by leveling down its objective particularities to a psychological common denominator, did not for some time occur to me. But the cumulative effect of this procedure gradually began to register in my consciousness. I found that, having baptized a Christian verity in the waters of psychological experience, something seemed to have been washed away from it—something that belonged to it as a part of my Christian inheritance. It no longer could be described in terms of an "inheritance." The tang of *history* had gone out of it. Its particularity had gone. Its objectivity as something *given* to me from beyond myself, had been reduced to my own subjective processes.

I had begun to be disturbed on this score some years before the opening of the past decade, but my restlessness did not come to a conscious focus. Through the years I had tried two forms of rationalization by which to keep my Christian values from falling into the bog of subjectivity. One of these was the philosophical theory that religious experience is inherently revelatory of objective truth and reality. It would greatly simplify matters, I thought, if we were able to affirm that knowledge of objectively valid truth comes to us in the experience of conversion, or of religious devotion, or of mystical contemplation. I played with this idea for some time, largely influenced by the encouragement which William James seemed to give to it in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*. But it did not deeply persuade me as an adequate solution of my problem. In the first place, I could not overcome a certain skepticism concerning the significance of the extraordinary experiences which were taken as the subject matter from which this doctrine was derived. My empiricism would not let me isolate the *religious* experience from "straight" experience, as something empirically *sui generis*. But my greater difficulty arose from the observation that the announcement of objective truth which comes out of religious experience is generally a confirmation of the beliefs with which the experient enters upon the experience. Though I recognized that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned," it did not follow that the things thus spiritually discerned were thereby objectively validated. This doctrine, therefore, did not provide an effective barrier against the subjectivity into which my empiricism seemed to be drawing me.

The other rationalization to which I had recourse was a kind of Kantian moralism which I anchored in the words of Jesus: "He that willeth to do the will of my Father, shall know of the doctrine." Mere inactive reflection upon God's existence leaves us, I was wont to argue, in agnosticism. But active obedience to the categorical imperative of duty yields such unity and satisfaction of life that one is justified in positing the existence of an objective God whose answer to one's active fidelity is this very unity and satisfaction of life. Therefore, the way to a knowledge of God is to live *as if* there were a God. This conception did duty over a long period as the best rationalization I could think of by which to keep my empiricism and my Christian inheritance from coming into open conflict with each other.

I prepared a sermon on this theme some years before I became editor of The Christian Century, and I suppose I have delivered it more than—well, I do not think I should confess how many times! I hope I shall never outgrow the truth that is in it. But though it is a good sermon —I vouch for it!—and its truth is indisputable, I claimed for the principle which it expounded altogether too much. A high-minded Buddhist could faithfully live up to the demands of the categorical imperative without ever coming to the knowledge of God which we have received in Christ Jesus. I still hold that Christianity is tested, not primarily in ratiocination, but in action. Nevertheless, the "will of my Father" which Jesus said I should test by acting upon it, is something *given* to me before I begin to act; it is part of my Christian inheritance, and is not generated in my psychological experience.

III

By the end of the 1920's, I was beginning to be conscious of the discrepancy between my two loyalties—my instinctive loyalty to my Christian inheritance and my intellectual loyalty to an empirical method of thought. I had baptized the whole Christian tradition in the waters of psychological empiricism, and was vaguely awaking to the fact that, after this procedure, what I had left was hardly more than a moralistic ghost of the distinctive Christian reality. It was as if the baptismal waters of the empirical stream had been mixed with some acid which ate away the historical significance, the objectivity and the particularity of the Christian revelation, and left me in complete subjectivity to work out my own salvation in terms of social service and an "integrated personality." The massive impressiveness and authority of the Christian gospel was petering down to a concern with "attitudes," "interests," "impulses," "values," "needs," "ideals." Observing others who, like myself, had come under the influence of this way of thought, I could see

that their presentation of Christianity as something *given,* something *done* before we ever came upon the scene, something therefore that stands objectively over against each soul of us, was being displaced by the attempt to release certain psychological "impulses," and to establish certain "attitudes"—a procedure generally described as "the deepening of religious experience."

I am, no doubt, exaggerating the sharpness with which I was aware of what was going on, both in myself and in others, because I am describing it in the clearer light of the present. Nevertheless, as I look back I can recall the definite eagerness and wistfulness with which I listened for some solving word. Karl Barth appeared on the scene. In 1926 I was in Germany and was hardly less eager to learn of Barth's theology which had already run like a flame through that country, than I was to hear discussions about international affairs. What I heard only confirmed my previous impression that Barth was essentially a biblical dogmatist of the fundamentalist stripe common in the United States. I dismissed him from my mind, and some years elapsed before my original misappraisal was corrected. Barth, however, has not been a factor in the change my mind has undergone during the past decade, except as I may have been influenced by the general atmosphere which his writings have had so great a part in generating. Barth did not emerge in the right place to be able to speak to my condition! He emerged in the stream of the Christian inheritance, and my problem arose by virtue of my honest commitment to the empirical way of thought. I had to be shown either (1) that this method of thought is wrong, or (2) that the subjectivity toward which it tends is due to a wrong use of the method by me and by the entire school of religious liberalism which was more or less under its influence.

IV

I was in this state of—shall I say?—expectant puzzlement when I encountered the mind of Henry Nelson Wieman. His first book, *Religious Experience and Scientific Method,* which I read in 1927, was what I had been waiting for. Wieman stood within the empiricist stream; he could therefore "speak to my condition." He radically revised my empirical outlook—indeed he *made* it an outlook, for previously it had been only an *inlook.* My thought had been, in a way, imprisoned in its own subjectivity. Wieman released it, set it free to explore in an objective order of reality the nature and character of a God whose existence does not require to be proved by any dogma, or authority, or rational argument, but who is the perceivable objective reality of immediate experience—not merely the *idea* of such a reality, nor a being whose existence we discern by some elusive *intuition,* or even by *faith* that such a reality exists.

Wieman's contribution to my thought at that time consisted chiefly in his removal of the problem of God's objective *existence* from the realm of doubt and controversy —and from the realm of bare faith—by means of what he called a "minimum" definition of God. "Whatever else the word God may mean," he said, "it is a term used to designate that Something upon which human life depends for its security, welfare and increasing abundance." In his later writings Wieman formulated this definition in many variations, but always on the same theme. The one that sticks in my consciousness most persistently is this: God is that Reality which is most worthy of man's supreme devotion. This definition was, of course, purely formal; it left out all consideration of the nature and character of God. But in segregating the question of existence from other questions, and so defining God that the question of existence was already settled in the definition, he turned me squarely around in the place where I stood. I could no longer search for God in the subjectivity of my own experience, but was now free to pursue the search for him in an order that was objective to myself. Thus Wieman was my Barth! He did for me what Barth has done for the less empirical theological mind of our generation. The supreme and permanent service which Barth has rendered Christian thought does not lie in his dogmatic identification of God as the Wholly Other, his doctrine of God's absolute transcendence of man and nature. It lies back of this. What Barth has done is to rescue a liberal generation from the swamp of subjectivity into which it had wandered under the spell of religious psychology. Barth and Wieman stand together in their common insight that God is not to be found in psychological experience, as such, but in Something upon which psychological experience—including reason and moral ideals—depends, and to which man's whole experience is the living response. However, Barth might have talked to me till doomsday, and I would still have been unpersuaded, because I was bound in intellectual honesty to a method of thought which his challenging insights could not shake.

In opening up the channel of empiricism so that experience, instead of turning in upon itself, now flowed out into the objective order, confronting there a *given* reality whose sovereignty over man has to be recognized and surrendered to, Wieman established for my thought the true relation between God and man—the relation which is inherent in Christianity, and which in loyalty to my Christian inheritance I always *knew* to be true, despite the imprisonment of my thought in a truncated empiricism. God is not man, and man is not God. Nor is God made in man's image, but man in the image of God. Human experience, then, is no test of God's reality; it must itself be tested evermore by the objective Reality that is God. This divine Reality is objective to our feelings, our reason and our moral ideals. God is not a human construct. He was on the scene before we came! Indeed, he brought us here! All those definitions of God which had been formulated by empirical liberalism—that he was "the universe idealized," or the "personification of our ideals," or the conceptual unification of a world whose meaning is what it is experienced *as*—these, always unsatisfactory, I now flung quite positively away. No definition of God in terms of any human function whatever could touch the reality of his being. For all this human functioning which we call "experience" is only our human response to the ever present, ever active initiative of God.

There was always a streak of Calvinism in me, notwithstanding the fact that Calvin, in the preaching of my father and of the Disciples' denomination in which he

reared me, was the *bête noire,* or at least the "whipping boy" of my youth. But the Disciples had originated in Presbyterianism, and cherished a "high" conception of deity. The sovereignty of God was no mere verbalism with us. We were not on such intimate terms with God as were, for example, the Methodists. We were more Calvinistic, and our Calvinism was even a bit tinctured with Deism. The "religious experiences" which were the characteristic features of Methodist and Baptist revivalism were held suspect. Over against these experiences of "getting religion" the Disciples set the principle of *obedience.* God has revealed his will in the Bible, they said. Man's part is by faith to accept the will of God there revealed and obey it, regardless of the presence or absence of a particular emotional experience. Their emphasis sometimes came perilously near to sheer legalism, but the peril of legalism was derived from their conception of a book revelation, not from their conception of God. Their theism was characterized by broad objectivity. They saw God's providence and purpose operating on a grand scale —in history and in nature. Men participated in the divine purpose by obedience to God's sovereign will.

So my sense of the inadequacy of all conceptions of God derived from "intuition," or romantic moralism, or a process of subjectivistic "idealizing" or "personification," must be measured against the background of my Christian belief in a God who is inexpressibly "high and lifted up," who stands over against man, "whose thoughts are not our thoughts nor his ways our ways." This background also will give some measure of the rebound in my thought when I was set free of all trifling with a God who was a mere conceptual symbol of human values and conscious needs.

V

The story of the past decade is the story of my effort to identify, by careful thinking, the God whom I now had an empirical right to search for in the objective order. I was gratefully conscious that the stream of my empirical way of thinking had begun to swerve appreciably *toward* the stream of my Christian inheritance with which it had hitherto run parallel. Would the two streams ever flow together? Can Christianity and the empirical method of thought flow in one and the same channel? These ten years have answered that question for me in an emphatic affirmative. Naturally, I read with particular openness of mind the writings of Professor Wieman himself. We spoke the same empirical language. His first advance beyond his minimum definition of God led him to his identification of God as "that order of existence and possibility" which is creatively working throughout the universe and in our midst, shaping our lives for good or ill according as we adjust our lives to its functioning.

This gave my thought at least a footing in objective reality for an empirical conception of God. I clung to it. From this foothold I was led on to many problems whose discussion I have been interested to follow, but concerning which I do not feel competent to have a strong opinion. One of these is the relation of God to the universe as a whole. Does this "order of existence and possibility" *include* the whole of reality, or is it an order *within* the universe? I am not fully persuaded either by Wieman's argument or that of Brightman that God is limited by some *given* element in reality. Another problem is that of personality in the divine nature. Here, I am somewhat inclined to agree with both sides! They both seem to come out at the same point, namely, that we cannot receive the fullness and richness of God's gifts to us unless we approach him as if he were a person. This, I think, is a place in which my "as if" sermon, to which I referred above, would be soundly applicable. In respect to these and many other questions, it is possible that my Christian inheritance outweighs my reasoning powers, and I am by no means sure that it is unempirical if it should be so.

The changes in my thinking during the past decade have arisen from the confluence of the two streams of allegiance which, prior to this period, flowed in separate channels. I no longer have any inhibition against exposing my Christian inheritance to my empirical way of thinking. And my empirical way of thinking, no longer content with squeezing a thin moralistic juice from the particularities of the Christian faith and throwing the rind away—as the prevailing liberalism has done—now finds in these particularities the very revelation of God. It is manifestly impossible to give here so much as a list of the changes that have occurred, to say nothing of offering an exposition of them. I must, however, name the fundamental insight whereby the two streams have been joined.

VI

This is my discovery of history. I have learned to look upon Christianity as a historical religion, and to see in its character as a historical religion the distinguishing feature which generically separates it from all other forms of religion. This marks a definite advance of my own thought beyond the position to which I was led by the writings of Professor Wieman. His philosophy of religion was first formulated in terms of psychology (including social psychology) and cosmology. But the objective "order of existence and possibility" to which I was introduced and by which I was pulled out of the bog of subjective empiricism, could not easily be clothed with qualities which gave it the right to command my adoration. It lent itself to scientific investigation, but could hardly claim to be an object of worship.

Reflecting on this, a voice spoke to me. It was the voice of my Christian inheritance. It said: This God whom you now identify as an "order of existence and possibility," but of whose character and nature you are unable to predicate those qualities which evoke your adoration, has actually, by his own creative initiative, revealed himself as a being who not only commands but is fully worthy to receive your adoration, your praise, and the full measure of your devotion. He has revealed himself as a righteous, gracious and loving God who offers salvation to all those who trust and obey him.

And I said: Where has he revealed himself? Not in my inner life, for that answer throws me back upon the very subjectivity from which my mind has been rescued. Not in the cosmos, for though his *presence* is, indeed, revealed in nature, his *character* is not clearly revealed there. Moreover, the distance between the cosmos and me is so vast

that I cannot take hold, savingly, of the tenuous threads of connection.

And the voice rebuked me, and said: Do you not know your Christianity? The divine order of existence and possibility upon which all men depend for those goods of life that are supremely worthful has revealed itself in *history* as the living God of truth and righteousness and love and justice. The God of the cosmos has come to man in *history*. The God of experience—of what you call the "inner life"—has come to man in *history*, and your inner life is your response to this divine self-revelation in history. *This* is your Christianity.

I pondered long upon this. Gradually its significance dawned on me. I began to see that it is in history that the cosmological and the psychological meet, for history is both the human aspect of the cosmos and the scene of the divine activity to which all human experience is the response. It is in history that the God of the cosmos has made known his character and nature. Thus for me the Christian revelation took on a new magnitude. Its fragmented parts reassembled themselves in a vast unity. Its massive impressiveness was restored. Our Christianity, then, I affirmed with renewed conviction, is *true!* The incarnation of the living God in Christ, the Christ of history, and the incarnation of the ever living Christ in the Christian community, the living church of history—this I began to see not merely as dogma to be believed, but as empirical, objective reality, unescapable reality, into whose living stream I have been born, and on which I depend with the same creatureliness which characterizes my participation in and dependence upon the world of nature to whose concreteness I so unescapably belong.

Every feature of my Christian inheritance has been affected, glowingly affected, by the uninhibited freedom of mind with which I now regard historical Christianity. How affected, I have not space to say. In my Lyman Beecher Lectures on *What Is Christianity?* delivered last spring at Yale University, I tried to set forth some of the results of this thesis. But neither writing nor lecturing is a fully satisfying medium in which to express the deepened and clarified assurance which the decade has brought me. I know of only one medium in which it could be given full expression, and that is the Christian pastorate. I keep cherishing a secret wish that I might return to one of my parishes and begin all over again as minister and shepherd of a single congregation. I am sure I would do many things differently. How differently, and what things, one should not venture to say in advance of being put to the test. But of course this secret wish only reflects a mood of nostalgic sentimentalism, and I shall have to stay in my ivory tower (!) of religious journalism where I can preach to my heart's content without exposing myself to the rigorous exactions which one faces when he undertakes to practice as well as preach.

A Pacifist Minister to His Brethren

By John Haynes Holmes

WE ARE STANDING in the shadow of an incredible calamity—the possible entrance of the United States into the Second World War which, as H. M. Tomlinson, the great English novelist, has expressed it, will present a "situation which will make Gabriel on the Last Day feel that his trumpet need make no announcement."

I

At the moment public sentiment is apparently dead set against taking this country into the European struggle. But the process of disintegration has yet to get well under way. Already this process has begun in the changed attitude of President and Congress toward a neutrality law passed all but unanimously two years ago in the cool determination to keep America out of war. It will advance rapidly in the days ahead, as the war clouds darken and the specter of fear besets us. Dreadful is the prospect which confronts us of the march of events, like the leaden footfalls of fate, carrying us down that same road to war which we traveled so blithely in 1914-17. Propaganda, preparedness, patriotism, like the three witches in *Macbeth*, will brew the same potion which poisoned us to madness two decades ago. Is it too early, as we face this ironic Armistice Day of 1939, to ponder the possibilities before us? What lies ahead if the war continues?

From the outbreak of hostilities this nation has begun to divide into two parts. On the one hand are great masses of the people, duly indoctrinated and drugged, who are ready to support a war which is being fought, we are being told as we were told in an earlier instance, to make the world safe for democracy. On the other hand stands a little group of steadfast men and women who refuse to be stampeded into barbarism and butchery, and insist, for the sake of democracy if nothing more, that they will not fight. As the President, like another Bolingbroke, opens "the purple testament of bleeding war," they will turn to the white testament of blessed peace for their gospel of salvation. These pacifists, who practice their principles in time of war, and do not merely prate them in time of peace, will suffer terribly. They will be like the disciples of the Master in the ancient day, sent forth "as sheep in the midst of wolves." The wolves of fanaticism and terror, of blind prejudice and passion, will bite with the upper teeth of the law and the lower teeth of the mob. Their fangs will rend and tear more fiercely than in the First World War, and we pacifists will be defenseless against them. For the reproach of the times will be upon us, and will condemn us.

First, there will soon grow up the damning charge that we are deserting our government when it most needs our loyalty, in time of war. The seriousness of this charge is

measured by the sanctity of government in the modern mind. All the divinity that once did hedge a king now hedges that administrative institution which is magically known as Washington. There came a time when men were delivered of the superstition of kings. But by a process familiarly known to the psychologists as transference, this superstition was straightway passed over to government, and there proceeded to do for the White House what it had formerly done for the throne. Now men are obedient servants of the state, as once they were the obedient subjects of the king. Than this state there is no higher authority on earth—not even God himself, says the Supreme Court, can dispute the fiat of the President or the law of Congress! And this authority the pacifists not only dispute but defy when they refuse to respond to the summons of the state to go to war. It is true that the government will not consult us, nor defer to us, as would seem to be its first duty in a democracy, but rather lay its mandate upon us as a dictator lays his mandate upon his slaves. But nonetheless we must give heed to this command not so much to die as to kill. And if we refuse to do this we will stand condemned, even as the early Christians who bowed not down to Caesar were condemned of their contemporaries.

Second, there will fall upon us in wartime the reproach that we are betraying the nation, the homeland, the dear country to which we have given our love and owe our devotion. This second charge is much more serious than the first, at least to millions of citizens who are delivered from the superstition of government but not from the lure of patriotism. A country is different from a government. Governments change, but a country remains. It is the sacred soil upon which the fathers trod and in which their bones lie buried. It is the blessed landscape of mountain, plain and river, precious to our eyes as the face of a friend. It is the larger home into which we were born, in which we have lived and found sustenance and comfort. It is the source of our language, our culture, our religion. It is the flag, the Constitution, Lincoln and Washington,

> Land of the Pilgrims' pride,
> From every mountain-side
> Let Freedom ring.

This is the passion which the pacifist affronts. He shares this passion with his fellow citizens. He is moved as deeply as any man by the thought of country. Full often has he said to himself, with profound emotion, "This is my own, my native land." But he cannot act upon this passion like other men. He will not take the live coals from off his country's altar and spread conflagration through the world. He refuses to use his love of country as a sword to destroy or even to maim the country of a fellow being. Not even to protect his own home will he burn another man's home to the ground. Therefore is he denounced as coward, renegade, traitor, by those who love father and mother, fatherland and motherland, more than they love all else, and therewith count themselves worthy.

A third reproach has to do with the church, which in all probability will eventually do exactly what it has done in every war in history—bless the sword and sanctify the swordsman. As the drift toward American entrance into the war gains momentum prelates and priests, like the official medicine men of every age, will summon the people to do battle in the name of the Lord. Synods and councils, in this age as in the dark ages, will find reason to declare that this war—not the last war, nor the one before that!—but *this* war, is a holy war. The overwhelming majority of laymen will of course clamor for allegiance to God's cause, by which they will mean only allegiance to governmental policy. Then will the pacifist ministers be "on the spot"! We will be accused of using our pulpits for subversive purposes. We will be charged with imposing seditious ideas upon the minds of the people. Especially will we be denounced for dismembering the church—for spreading confusion before its altars, at the very time when the unity of the spirit should be the bond of war. Then will we be subjected to a hundred tests of loyalty, whether we say "shibboleth" or "sibboleth." The words we use—what do they mean; the scripture passages we read—what do they imply; our attitude toward the flag, toward the Liberty Loan campaigns, toward the Red Cross drives—what do they involve? We will be taken, as the early Christians were taken, only this time not by the state merely but by the church, and challenged to lay upon the altar our pinch of salt in recognition and adoration of Caesar made divine; and, if we refuse, like the early Christians again, we will be cast if not to the lions, then to the dogs of war which rend with equal ferocity.

A final reproach, more poignant if not more dangerous than any other, will come when war comes. I refer to the reproach that we are deserting our boys and girls, more especially our young men, in the hour of their extremity. Let us not forget that it is upon youth that the burden of war is laid. The moment war is declared, a conscription act will be passed and millions of our sons, the best that can be chosen from the mass, will be seized and slain in the spirit of human sacrifice, not in defense of their own soil, for nobody is going to attack us here, but in invasion of some foreign soil in Asia, or Europe, or the islands of the seas. These boys won't want to go to war. Why must we have a conscription act if not because the recruits are unwilling to serve? No, these boys will be forced to do what they would gladly avoid—go into the shambles of such ghastly death as mankind has never hitherto seen or imagined. And at such time, God knows, they will need the comfort, the assurance, the approval, the blessing which we pacifists, just because we are pacifists, cannot give.

For let there be no confusion upon this point! We cannot denounce war and refuse to support it on moral and spiritual grounds, and at the same time sustain those who under whatsoever compulsion participate in war. Our task is to sustain those who will *not* participate. We must begin the business, in other words, of preparing the day, forecast by William Ellery Channing, in his immortal lecture on *War,* when the soldier's uniform will be as unattractive as the hangman's. Is it imaginable that, in this awful dilemma, we can escape reproach? Channing did not think so, else he would not have spoken of the possibility of the pacifist's being "hurried to prison" or "brought thence to be shot," nor added, with a grimness

unusual in so gentle a spirit, that "there must be martyrs to peace as well as to other principles of religion."

II

Such are the indictments which will be brought against us—that we are deserting the government, betraying the nation, degrading the church and failing youth. From all these reproaches the supporters of war will be delivered. But will their souls be easy, and their hearts light? Will their consciences within them be at peace? Are there not other and more terrible reproaches which these men will know, as pacifists, in God's mercy, will never know them?

I have said that pacifists must bear the reproach in war of deserting the government. But this is surely not so heavy to bear as the reproach of deserting God. And this is precisely the reproach which must rest upon those who make appeal to arms. For God, in the true essence of his being, cannot be brought to the battlefield. No incantations or enchantments, no sorceries or charms, no hocus-pocus of any kind, not even sincere and earnest prayer, can avail to persuade the Most High to participate in war. It is true that men have ceaselessly practiced obscene rites to the end of enlisting God in tribal or nationalistic ranks. The priests and pastors who celebrated religion on one side or the other in the First World War and, as the soldiers prepared to go over the top, invoked God's blessing upon German or Allied arms, these were only repeating in our time the performances of Roman augurs who on the altars of ancient battlefields offered up to Jupiter the smoking entrails of sacrificial beasts or, in an elder day, of painted medicine men who leaped and danced, and slashed their bleeding flesh, in propitiation of jungle deities for victory.

But God cannot thus be summoned; or, if summoned, he will not answer. For he remains "above the battle." A universal deity, his spirit is one, and therefore one with all mankind. "Have we not all one father," cried the Hebrew prophet; "hath not one God created us?" To which the Christian apostle gave answer, "God hath made of one all nations of men, for to dwell on the face of the earth." Such a God can be no respecter of persons, nor yet of nations. He can be persuaded as little to patriotism as to partisanship. His dwelling is in no capitol, behind no frontiers, beneath no flag, but in

> . . . the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man.

To sanction war is to deny this one God and Father of all. To take up arms against our fellow men, to divide the human family into enemies and friends, to lie and hate and kill, is to desert his will and dishonor his name. To pray for victory in our camp is to profane his holy spirit. Whatever the issue of so-called righteousness in war, there is one law of righteousness which is supreme—the divine will to brotherhood. This we must obey, after the example of Peter who declared that "we must obey God rather than men." But it is just this which the soldier, the chaplain, the Y.M.C.A. worker, the war-monger and patrioteer, do *not* obey. Therefore, whatever the rewards of government, they bear the reproach of God.

I have said that the pacifist must bear the reproach in war of betraying his nation. But what is this compared to the reproach, laid upon every supporter of war, of betraying the Kingdom? We know what this Kingdom is—the vision of every true prophet who has been since the beginning of the world, of a universal realm upon this earth which shall absorb all tribes and clans, principalities and powers, and make them one sovereignty of God. We know what the nature of this Kingdom is—a rule in which God's will shall be the law, and that law the law of peace. Isaiah proclaimed this Kingdom when he said that "out of Zion shall go forth the law, . . . and [men] shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Jesus had this Kingdom in mind when he bade his disciples to "resist not evil," but to "love [their] enemies," and, in the supreme moment of his life, bade his disciple to "put up [his] sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Why did Jesus weep over Jerusalem, if not because he saw the failure of his Kingdom in the destruction of the city which could not, or would not, learn "the things which belong unto peace"? How would Jesus weep today over our world, which is supposed to be Christian, as he saw his worshipers, unmindful of the Kingdom, taking up arms for America, or France, or Germany, or Britain!

I have said that the pacifist in wartime must bear the reproach of confusing, dividing and misleading the church—of refusing to obey the church, when the church elects to obey the state in its mandate to take up arms. But what about religion—a very different thing from the church, and ever a nobler thing than all ecclesiasticism? We know what religion is—in every age, and in every place, the incarnation in men's lives of the spirit of universal love. It is no accident that in every religion in history the law of love is central. It is natural, indeed inevitable, that Judaism and Christianity should be one in their fundamental commandment of love to God and love to man. It is inescapable that every spiritual ideal, like every moral code, should find ultimate expression not in hatred, or vengeance, or violence of any kind, but in sympathy, humility, compassion, mercy, forgiveness till seventy times seven. "Never does hatred cease by hatred," says Buddha; "hatred ceases by love. Let us, therefore, overcome anger by kindness, and evil by good."

This is religion—the law of God laid upon our souls! What if the church be faithless to it? Is it our business at any price to serve the church, to follow the church? The church has fostered superstition; must we be superstitious? The church has ordered persecutions; must we be persecutors? The church has gone to war; shall we go, too? Yes, if the church is our main concern. But I see something more important, more precious, than any church. It is the revelation of God's love. In the light of that revelation, war is the final blasphemy, the unforgivable sin. Therefore I do say that to sanction war, support war, apologize for war, or compromise with war, is to betray religion. It was Roman soldiers, commanded by a Roman captain, himself under orders of a military governor of a military empire, who drove the nails into the hands and feet of Christ.

Lastly—our young people! I have said that the pacifist is charged with deserting them in the hour of their extremity. Is he deserting them, or is he trying to guard them, guide them, protect them? And what is the supporter of war doing, the man who excuses war, justifies war, seeks support of war—what is *he* doing with our boys, if not betraying them, like some vile pander, to vice and crime? Do you remember the newspaper cartoon which two years ago won the Pulitzer Prize? The central figure in this picture, as I remember it, is a woman of the streets—an ugly drab, who has seen better days, all bedizened with cheap finery and living color. This female is labeled "War." Beside her stands a fair young man, eighteen or nineteen years of age, a little shocked, a good deal frightened, but tempted nonetheless by passions inbred of the dead centuries gone by. And the woman is leering at the young man, and taking his hand, and smiling and beckoning; and she says, "Come along . . . *I knew your father!*"

Now, what are we doing for that boy? What are we going to do for him tomorrow, or the next day, when the old courtesan, with her perfumes and her decorations, comes reaching for him, as she reached two decades ago, not unsuccessfully, for his father? Shall we be betraying him if we tell him the truth about this poisoned hag who has walked the highways of the world for ages, consuming youth with her fevered lusts—that she is foul and dirty and diseased, that she defiles the body and rots the soul, and woos the way to death? Or shall we be betraying this boy if we tell him that this temptress is an angel, and that it is *dulce et decorum* (sweet and glorious) to yield to her? That's what the supporter of war does with this young man! He turns him over to the embrace of this shameless harlot, and bestows the blessing of God upon the union. The crime of the war-mongers against our youth is incredible, as it is indescribable. Jesus had the word for it: "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones to stumble, it were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the depths of the sea."

III

Such are the reproaches which in the end, if not at the time, must fall upon those who support participation in the war. They will be deserting God, betraying the Kingdom, abandoning religion and prostituting youth. There are those aplenty who, for the sake of government and native land and church, will accept these reproaches, nor be ashamed. But we are not of them. Come, therefore, let us make a stand! "Can we not resist this contagion? . . . Do we not fight against the plague?" In this fight we may succeed, and save the world from death. If we fail, we *fail!* But in the end, we cannot fail. What we endure and suffer now shall be as seed cast into the furrows of the world's great agony. That seed will spring, not like the dragon's teeth, into a harvest of armed men, but like the blood of the martyrs, into a harvest of love and peace—an imperishable harvest that will feed men for their salvation.

War may haunt us long. The four horsemen may ride again, and yet again. But some day, when desolation has done its worst, will come a miracle upon the earth, as came a miracle one day upon our western plains. Do you remember the story of Chief Joseph, greatest of the Indian leaders in this country in the last century? He had fought long and hard against the United States—and in a righteous cause, as against those who used the flag to despoil his people! But on a day the great chief caught a vision, and made a resolve. Gathering his warriors about him in the quiet evening, he stood calmly and grandly before them, and he said:

Hear me, my warriors; my heart is sick and sad.
Our chiefs are killed;
The old men are all dead;
It is cold, and we have no blankets;
The little children are freezing to death.
Hear me, my warriors; my heart is sick and sad.
From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever.

Sight-Seeing

By William K. Anderson

I HAVE SEEN a tangle of ants mired in the dregs of a honey jar to which they had come to sate themselves in sweetness:

I have seen the protecting globe of an electric light darkened by the dried remains of a thousand insects that have found death as they sought light:

I have seen fish frantically flapping and gasping on a boat bottom, having been lured by a metal spoon to eat a glue-and-hair fly:

I have seen mice with their noses against a morsel of cheese and their backs broken by the sudden snap of a steel spring:

I have seen, lying beside the highway or ground under the tire-treads of hundreds of passing cars, the carcasses of dogs, cats, bunnies and other animals of the night that were dazzled by the bright lights:

I have seen gorgeous sedans full of exuberant youth, shouting in glee as they streaked to meet death at the corner:

I have seen those who once thought that it was always fair weather when good fellows got together, gathered in huddles of consolation in the rainy days of later life, on street corners and in flop-houses, poor-houses and asylums:

I have seen dirty doorways darkened by the used up bodies of old women still in their thirties, who might have been the mothers of happy children:

I have seen tiers of gray cells, with sullen clanking doors, housing men who occasionally have tears on their gray faces because, in the search for the glamor of life, they have neglected its laws:

I have seen the bodies of successful and shrewd men, lying in beautiful caskets and surrounded by soft luxury, who have left behind them untold piles of property but no aching hearts:

I have seen two generations of civilized human beings using the magical products of a God-given science for self-destruction.

BOOKS

Data Without Enlightenment

RELIGION IN PRIMITIVE SOCIETY. *By W. D. Wallis. F. D. Crofts & Company, $5.00.*

THE title of this volume tends to indicate at once the purpose of the author and the scope of his work. I say tends to indicate, for there is nowhere any explicit statement of purpose (except on the cover, and that is the publisher's venture). The table of contents lists twenty chapters, but neither their headings nor their contents restrict the scope of the volume to things "primitive." It may be, indeed, that the publisher chose the title! In any event the reader looks for a discussion of religion in primitive cultures, and finds also a somewhat confusing admixture of materials from higher levels of human society.

Under the twenty headings the contents range all the way from "The Sphere of Religion" and a discrimination between "The Natural and the Supernatural" through "Sacred Places," objects, trees, animals, persons and gods, and the motives, concepts and acts which accompany the practice of primitive religion, to cultural impacts and variations and the play of reason and caprice within the field. The chapters may be read separately in any order of sequence, but the book is best evaluated by means of an examination of its contents in the order of their presentation. There are 330 pages of materials within the twenty subdivisions, along with 36 pages of bibliography and a 22-page index. The bibliography is arranged by chapters—save for XVII which may have been omitted by mistake—being thus of general application to the various topics. Its range is remarkable, although many important works are missing, e.g., Sumner-Keller, *Science of Society,* G. P. Murdock, *Our Primitive Contemporaries.* The volume is encyclopedic, is a compilation, a mass of interesting if not altogether new materials.

There is no special argument, nor any theory explicitly set forth. Nor are definitions offered, either of religion or of primitive. The data are descriptive, with references to things which religion "includes." To be sure, the work is anthropological, and, as the author says, "Anthropology . . . is content to identify and describe the forms. . . ." All religion and the "supernatural" seem to be equated (p. 2) and yet the author contends that "religion can be treated without respect to its geographic or cultural occurrence" (p. 308). Does he mean that an anthropologist can understand and describe belief, ritual, prayer and ideas in the abstract? He offers only concrete data from the wide world of religion. The reader, especially the comparative religionist, has at least the right and the responsibility to examine the materials, in an effort to establish their bearing—psychological, theological and otherwise—on religion. What sort of structure may one build of them, and for what sort of spirit's dwelling? If any spirit (theory) walks among the data which Professor Wallis gives us, it might be called on the one hand animism (somewhat Tylorian) and on the other hand fear. "Soul" and "sacred" often interchange. He builds without warrant (p. 27) a "house of God" out of a single "sacred stone *in which* the deity dwelt" (italics mine, for the stone was originally a mere symbol). And, says he, "The fear of God is . . . the beginning of religion" (p. 323). Religion, in fact, had long existed before deity or the divine was thought of in capitals. And he adds, "When no fear enters, there is no religion." I ask, Is God without religion (however fearful anthropomorphized gods have been at times)?

More serious, perhaps, are the volume's weak generalizations (e.g., "Buddhist China," "Chinese Buddhism," "an Egyptian priest," etc.), its lifting of references from their appropriate context (e.g., from the Vedas, the Koran, and so on, *and* from particular localities and times, thus disregarding *stages* of development), unless, indeed, all this really does no violence to the conception of the primitive! However, it seems a great fault in certain respects to cite "the Hindus and Santal" (p. 171), thus mixing Indo-European and Dravidian cultures, and to jumble in a single paragraph (p. 26) the Transvaal, Samoa, Ceylon, brahmans, Moslems and Christians, not for comparison, but for an uncritical identification of "footprints of gods." If one would get the full force of possible objections to this meaty and useful volume, let him examine certain items closely. There is no "god known as Svayambhu" (p. 289, given as Svayamblm, by mistake). The "paygun" is a Maratha figure or power (associated on p. 19 with "the Hindu"). A single quotation should not, obviously, appear in two different versions (pp. 267, 288; nor should this "saying" of Mohammed in disparagement of woman ignore another saying of his, that "the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous woman"). The Abbé Dubois is dated 1936 A. D., instead of 1817. Ormazd is still potent "in Persia" (p. 66).

Perhaps this review is not altogether justified in asking of the author a stricter accounting for times, places, and so forth, in the classification of materials. However, the author himself professes to treat "the cultural and psychological significance of the forms of religion as belief and behavior." Significance, we may insist, is more inclusive, and meaning lies deeper than the surface of a form. Although the student of religion continues to be dependent upon the anthropologist, the world of religion is so full of a number of things that he is increasingly concerned with close scrutiny and valid interpretation.

JOHN CLARK ARCHER.

Paradise Gained

AFTER THIS. *By Ryland Kent. Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

DANTE wrote of the experiences men encounter after death, the punishment of those who are irreclaimable, the toilsome ascent of others up the mountain of Paradise. Milton also laid some of his best scenes in an otherworldly setting. Neither of them can be laughed off, even yet, though some of their celestial and infernal topography can be laughed at if one has the temerity. What Dante tried to do cannot be considered preposterous, considering his achievement and the impress it has made on the men of six centuries since his death.

The able writer who conceals his identity under the *nom de plume* of "Ryland Kent" has undertaken to do in a modern way what Dante did in a medieval way—that is, to tell what happens "after this." Fiction, not epic, is the popular literary medium of our time; therefore he uses that form. Dante pictured the fortunes of the famous dead. Ryland Kent traces the progress of certain persons who went down together in a sinking ship. Dante had a Ptolemaic cosmogony, plus certain fantastic additions of his own invention; Ryland Kent has none that can be diagrammed. Dante had Hell, Purgatory and Paradise, and a Catholic theology. Ryland Kent has only a pleasant purgatory (he does not call it that) where people gradually shed their errors and are disciplined for the ascent to successively higher planes. Since they all ultimately get on, one may say

that his theology is universalism, and since their discipline is in kindly deeds, charitable judgments and a recognition of the essential truth in all religions, under the tutelage of a Hindu guide, it would appear to be also an ethical monotheism with strong leanings toward Oriental mysticism. The author has handled his difficult task with great skill. The story is really interesting, and in spots amusing. (Amusing, that is, when he means it to be amusing; never amusing because absurd.) The difficulty is to give sufficient plausibility to the rather naturalistic earthly setting of the celestial life. But considering that earthly materials are the only ones we know about, and that even the writer of the Apocalypse had to describe the heavenly city in terms of gold and glass and jewels and to use horsemen and lambs and synthetic beasts as symbols, it is not to be held against Ryland Kent that his place of discipline and instruction is a composite of the features of agreeable earthly landscapes, with a section of the Mojave desert for persons temporarily recalcitrant, and that his characters for the most part lead quite natural lives. One must assume the plausibility of all this as a presupposition of the art-form which he uses, as one accepts the absence of color in a marble statue. The work is done seriously, reverently and intelligently.

W. E. GARRISON.

Books in Brief

ESCAPE. *By Ethel Vance. Little, Brown & Company, $2.50.*

Condemned to death in Germany for treason to the reich, Emmy Ritter, former opera singer, awaits the fatal day. The story deals with the efforts of her friends, including her American artist son, to effect her release. It is a tense and vibrant tale. Its plot is one that could be conceived only by a mind that could produce good mystery stories, and its characterizations reveal an intimate knowledge of nazidom.

MAUD. *Edited and arranged by Richard Lee Strout. The Macmillan Company, $3.50.*

Maud Rittenhouse kept a diary and, discreetly edited by her son-in-law, this is it. The entries begin with 1881 and end with 1895, when she was about thirty years old. She was a young lady much given to falling in love and even more addicted to being fallen in love with. The diary, in good Victorian fashion, was her confidante. She lived in Cairo, Illinois, studied art in St. Louis, and won a thousand-dollar prize for a novel about North Carolina. Any young people of today who are interested in knowing what life was like "when grandma was young," need seek no farther. And any other claimants for the title of "the last Victorian" must reckon with Maud.

Books Received

The Story of the Political Philosophers. By George Catlin. Whittlesey House, $5.00. (To be reviewed.)

Our Knowledge of God. By John Baillie. Scribners, $2.50. (To be reviewed.)

Mind Explorers. By John K. Winkler and Walter Bromberg. Reynal & Hitchcock, $3.00. (To be published Nov. 10.)

Let Us Pray for Our Dead. By Bernard A. Hausmann, S. J. America Press, 75 cents. An English translation of the Roman Catholic "Office of the Dead."

The Economic and Social Environment of the Younger Churches. By J. Merle Davis. International Missionary Council, 156 Fifth Ave., New York, $1.00. This very important monograph, prepared for the Madras Conference, has the unqualified approval of such experts in missions as Dr. A. L. Warnshuis and Dr. William Paton. Its presentation of the environmental influences, both helpful and hindering, upon the development of the "younger churches" in mission lands gives concreteness to the whole problem and should be carefully studied by churches on the sending end of the missionary life-line as well as by those on the receiving end.

To the End of the World. By Helen White. Macmillan, $2.50. The author has developed a remarkable technique in the writing of historical religious fiction with no sacrifice of either historical accuracy or narrative interest. The research work for her *A Watch in the Night,* a magnificent study of Jacopone da Todi, was done, if we remember correctly, on a Guggenheim fellowship. The present book is the story of a youth who went to Cluny to become a monk the year before the French Revolution.

In Place of Splendor, The Autobiography of a Spanish Woman. By Constancia de la Mora. Harcourt, $3.00. (To be published Nov. 16.)

Human Nature and the Nature of Evil. By Clarence R. Skinner. Universalist Pub. House, $1.00. A convinced liberal refuses to be intimidated by the show of sin and suffering in the modern world, and with chastened optimism still holds that partial and temporary evil is but a preliminary stage of universal good.

And Thy Neighbor As Thyself. By Emerson Hugh Lalone. Universalist Pub. House, $1.00. A compact and adequate history of the social ethical principles, attitudes and actions of Universalists in the United States.

Characters in "Tales of a Wayside Inn." By John van Schaick, Jr. Universalist Pub. House, $1.50. Longfellow imaginatively assembled at Sudbury Tavern a company of characters into whose mouths he put the "tales." They were, in reality, selected from among his own friends and acquaintances. To identify them and picture them as historical persons against the background of their time and place is the purpose of Dr. van Schaick's delightful volume. The author (editor of the *Universalist Leader* since 1922) must have enjoyed writing it, and the reader will enjoy reading it. Besides presenting facts gathered by patient research, the book has charm and atmosphere.

The Church in Rural Life. By David Edgar Lindstrom. Garrard Press, Champaign, Ill., 85 cents. Eight lectures, delivered at Garrett Biblical Institute, on various aspects of rural life and especially the part that the church plays and should play.

Leviathan and the People. By R. M. MacIver. Louisiana State University Press, $2.00. (To be published Nov. 10.)

Back to Self-Reliance. By Matthew N. Chappell. Whittlesey House, $2.00. The author aims to show "how paternalism in the home, school, society and government exerts a disintegrating influence on character and personality," and how self-help and self-reliance are the way out. The author, a psychologist, illustrates by many brief case studies. He is rather too sure that everyone else is wrong to permit complete assurance that he is right. However, allowing for the fact that he omits one side of the picture—the interdependence of men in the modern world where self-reliance does not solve the whole problem—his emphasis is wholesome and his argument stimulating. But mutual aid is just as important as self-reliance.

Which Way, Democracy? By Wilfred Parsons, S. J. Macmillan, $2.00. There is a great amount of wisdom, truth and true humanitarianism in the chapters on industrial, racial and international justice. But reliable guidance for the future course of democracy is not to be sought from an author who starts with "the decline of Christianity" (since the Middle Ages) and "the downfall of liberalism," and finds the title deeds of democracy and "the Christian concept of the state" in the writings of Thomas Aquinas, Suarez and Bellarmine.

Child Labor Facts, 1939-1940. By Gertrude Folks Zimand. National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Ave., New York, 25 cents. A booklet of data concerning the present employment of children in the United States and recent legislation and decisions.

The Car Belongs to Mother. By Priscilla Hovey Wright. Houghton Mifflin Co., $1.35. A hilarious commentary ostensibly on the way women drive automobiles but actually covering the whole subject of amateur chauffering, conflicting claims to transportation and domestic relations in the one-car family.

Intelligence and Crime, A Study of Penitentiary and Reform-

atory Offenders. By Simon H. Tulchin. University of Chicago Press, $2.00. Data and conclusions based on psychological tests in Illinois penal institutions over a seven-year period. The offenders, considered as a single group, compare not unfavorably in intelligence with the army draft. Classification by race and crimes, however, reveals some instructive variations.

A Leader's Guide to the Brownie Scout Program. Girl Scouts, 14 W. 49th St., New York, 50 cents. Summarizes the Girl Scouts program of study, games and discipline so far as concerns the seven-to-ten-year age group.

Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats. By T. S. Eliot. Harcourt, $1.25. Not to be published until Nov. 16, but perhaps it is no premature disclosure of a secret to say that this book, while clever enough in its way and containing material doubtless originally designed solely for the amusement of tolerant friends, is important (if it is) only because T. S. Eliot wrote it.

CORRESPONDENCE

Schools in Korea Stay Closed

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: In your issue of October 18 at the bottom of page 1280 your Japan correspondent says that the Union Theological Seminary at Pyeng Yang, Korea, opened August 31. They so planned, but as the government insisted on their going to Shinto shrines and doing obeisance if they opened, it was decided not to open. The Bible institutes for men and women at Pyeng Yang also closed for the same reason.

Princeton, N. J. S. L. ROBERTS, President.

Dr. Wieman to Dr. Bennett

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: I am in hearty accord with everything that Professor Bennett writes in his article on neutrality except what he says about "Wieman and Holt." What I write below, then, is not to be understood in any way as disputing his proposals and interpretations concerning the war and our relation to it. I shall frequently resort to the first person because I am not consulting Professor Holt and absolve him of all responsibility for what I say.

Professor Bennett claims to have an insight into the tragedy of the situation from which Wieman and Holt are excluded. I fear he is mistaken in this exclusive claim to the tragic sense. I fully appreciate the tragedy he so well depicts and felt it keenly when I wrote the article. But in that writing I was striving to state with the utmost possible brevity certain issues which we felt should be made as clear as possible without anything added to obscure the sharp edges. Therefore I left out many things that need to be said. I am glad that Dr. Bennett has said some of these other things.

His comments about "Wieman and Holt," however, are not so pleasant. He begins and ends his article with references to our statement about "the little peninsula which has lost its importance in our planetary life." In his first reference he insinuates that we are guilty of the stupidity of holding this view on the ground that the British inhabit small islands. How can they be so influential if the geographical area of their country is so small! I am sure that Professor Bennett does not think that we hold such a view. Then why does he try to make it appear so by his remark? I am almost tempted to think that the war hysteria has taken possession of him and he is beginning to resort to that vicious kind of taunt and jibe which comes upon even the best of men when the madness grips them. I here ask him: Does he really think that Wieman and Holt or anyone else believes Europe has lost its planetary importance because of the smallness of the islands which the British inhabit? If he does not think so, then why does he try to smear them with that insinuation?

At the close of the article he suggests that Gandhi, unlike Wieman and Holt, "cannot take comfort in the idea that 'the little peninsula' of Europe has 'now lost its importance for our planetary life.'" He then adds immediately, "It is well to remember that that little peninsula is thickly inhabited by persons." Such a juxtaposition of sentences can mean only one thing to the casual reader, and it is monstrous. When Wieman and Holt say that the peninsula has lost its importance they mean that the persons there are not important and that we need not be concerned about their suffering. I am sure that I could pick out some fragment of a sentence from his article and make it mean something just as misleading. But I would never dream of doing it. Again I ask Mr. Bennett: Does he honestly think that when we say the peninsula has lost its importance we are ignoring the plight of the millions of persons who suffer there under the horror of war? If he does not believe that then why does he make such a false insinuation?

I judge it is needless to say that Holt and Wieman take no more comfort in the evils that have befallen Europe than does Gandhi. Also the context makes plain our meaning about the European peninsula's losing its importance in our planetary life. What was its importance? Nothing less than the leadership of the world. Our exact statement was: "Heretofore world history was made in Europe." It is this importance which Europe has lost, namely, the status of being the chief—but not the only—determiner of destiny for our planetary life so far as any political and cultural center can exercise such influence. Our claim that it has lost this status partly because of the consequences of the present war is a prophecy, and like all prophecies is precarious. We may be mistaken. Europe may emerge from this war stronger than Russia on the one hand and the United States on the other. I, however, do not think so. The statement which Professor Bennett quotes with so many misleading insinuations is the prophecy that it will not. Many years may have to pass before we can know with certainty whether this prophecy is true. But there is nothing in our statement to indicate that we feel that the persons who so thickly inhabit Europe are unimportant as persons.

Others besides Professor Bennett have written with misunderstanding of our statement that America's entry into the last war made possible the injustice of the Versailles treaty. Critics have said that in making that statement we are indulging in the idleness of imagining what history would have been if things had been different. That is exactly what we did not do. Either our entry into the war made some difference or else it did not. If it made no difference then all the blood and other cost was utterly pointless because everything would have been just the same, including the treaty of Versailles. If it did make any difference to the war, then the treaty of peace must have been one place where that difference was recorded. One can of course indulge in fancies of what would have happened if we had not entered the war. Germany might have won and made a worse treaty or some other monstrous thing might have happened. But that is all speculation. What we do know is that a dictated peace is almost inevitably worse than a negotiated peace. Our entry into the last war was one factor which produced a dictated peace. Therefore we are to that degree responsible for the evils of the Versailles treaty. If we enter this present war we are likely to become again responsible for a like evil.

Chicago. HENRY NELSON WIEMAN.

Don't Waste Tears on Lansbury

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: "Poor Lansbury," says Reinhold Niebuhr in his recent "Leaves from the Notebook of a War-Bound American," referring to George Lansbury's last-minute efforts to stop war and preserve the peace. I feel like saying, "Poor Niebuhr!" The sight of George Lansbury, at an age when most men have fully banked their fires and are content to rest on their lees, conducting his missions of reconciliation, calling the nations to decent and honor-

able international conduct, casting his one vote of seven against war, is one of the few really heroic and truly Christian spectacles of our time. The memory of it will outlast the scorn of cynics who imagine they know this wicked world so much better than he does.

To keep on being Christian, not to deviate one hair's breadth even though the whole world is running against you, here is something to make the angels rejoice and devils tremble. Men like "Old George" are the only evidence that the contemporary world has produced to make men face the future with hope. All honor to his name, and more power to his pacifism!

South Street Methodist Church, Lynn, Mass. CLARENCE F. AVEY.

Report from a Student Group

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: It was with considerable shock and discouragement that we read in the newspapers of October 23 that Rev. Frank R. Wilson had prayed in Hyde Park, N. Y., in the presence of President Roosevelt that King George VI may have the strength to "vanquish and overcome all his enemies." The explanation offered by him to the press was not convincing, so on Tuesday, October 24, as four students preparing for the Christian ministry we called on Mr. Wilson to question him further and to protest. Were it not that the issues involved at the root of this incident are basic ones we should all let it pass. And certainly we as students should express our humility in criticizing where our own experience is so limited. But there are three points which seem to us to be of serious concern.

Mr. Wilson assured us that he meant no political significance in this traditional prayer which he borrowed from the Canadian prayer book. It was just a natural part of his service which he closed as usual with a prayer for peace. The prayer is used in Canada in peacetime and goes back as far as the sixteenth century. And furthermore he was praying for the "spiritual" enemies of the king. In the light of Mr. Wilson's sincerity we felt that it was plainly a lack of foresight and, if the word is not too strong, naiveté to suppose that in a situation like ours today such a prayer could have no political significance or would convey to those sharing in it, if they were aware of its words at all, only the meaning of "spiritual" enemies. (It might be more appropriate to pray for the "spiritual" enemies of Hitler, which are in all likelihood more dangerous than those of King George.) We have since learned from high Episcopalian authority that the actual meaning of the words, whatever the rector may have meant, is that of mortal enemies. However, the thing to be lamented is the dark prospect in store for the church if its clergymen are so bound to tradition or so removed from the stream of current affairs as to exercise so little judgment as we think Mr. Wilson did.

A second issue, and immediately important for Christianity, is whether by any accident or possible excuse the church can be led to sanction war. In the Oxford Conference report on "The Church and War" it was stated: "All Christians acknowledge one Lord whose claim upon them is such as to transcend all other loyalties. Here is the first obligation of the church, to be in living fact that church, a society with a unity so deep as to be indestructible by earthly divisions of race, or nation, or class." The church has certainly suffered ever since the last war for its shameful part in it, and we are glad that Mr. Wilson fully shared the conviction that the church could not rightly sanction war, or pray for the victory of one side or another in war.

Lastly, this unfortunate incident is a dramatic illustration of how easily we Americans lend ourselves to support the Allied powers. We hardly know that we are doing it. Mr. Wilson spends his summers in Canada where the prayer became natural to him (and as he indicated, may have so become to the President during his vacations there), and there was nothing hostile meant by it. It did reflect, however, an unconscious exaltation of the importance of British welfare.

But we must not fool ourselves in the present situation. Whatever our natural sympathies may be, this is no holy war in which the Allied powers are out to preserve "democratic civilization." And as soon as we Americans make up our minds on which motive will govern our attitude: whether, first of all, we feel that the Allied powers must win at all costs, or whether, first of all, that the world's peace and justice can best be served by America's staying out of war at all costs, the clearer our policy will be. The first attitude certainly seems to be behind the move to repeal the mandatory embargo on arms, for repeal is only the first step toward increasingly involving our interests in an Allied victory. But if we wish basically for America to stay out of war, it is absolutely inconsistent for us so to allow our interest in and support for the Allied powers to grow as to involve us in the necessity of their victory.

New York, N. Y. WILLIAM LOVELL, HOWARD SPRAGG, ROBERT KELLEY, JOHN D. WOLF.

A Commission of Neutrals

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: Is not the absence of a commission of neutral nations the greatest hindrance to peace at this time? Such a commission has been proposed by both the National Peace Conference in the United States—a conference representing the entire peace movement of this country—and by the National Peace Council, a similar organization in Great Britain. The existence of such a commission would greatly hearten men in all countries who, like Lloyd George, are urging an immediate exploration of every avenue of peace. Alone, the warring nations find themselves unable to discover a formula for peace. Would it not be a test of the sincerity of those who say they want peace if the President would call such a commission into existence, a commission ready to meet and act on a moment's notice? If any belligerent, claiming that it wants peace, refuses this disinterested offer, let it answer to its own war-weary people and to a terror-stricken world for its refusal.

Portland, Ore. J. J. HANDSAKER.

The Child in the Church

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: Many of us agree thoroughly with Professor Knox's conviction that all of us need the sense of belonging to a historic and present Christian community. But to equate this goal with the presence or absence of Bible stories in the church program of a five-year-old and with the "conditioning" theory of learning, is not clear thinking, and may serve to delay the acceptance of this desirable goal in church and church school programs.

It is possible that the Christian community might be mediated best to boys and girls through warm Christian personalities with whom they might work in the church. In the striking illustration at the beginning of his article, Professor Knox will note that the plight of the Negro intellectual in France was that he was actually out of touch with the toiling, suffering Negro community—not that he did not know the history of the Negro race. Further, Professor Knox will find that most of the people in charge of church programs for and with boys and girls are today quite humble—they know they cannot do it all. They believe that the church program must be built on the thesis that the Bible must come to a child through his parents: that the *home* must build a religious culture that will supply to the child familiarity with the religious heritage found in the Bible, partially freeing the church to deal with the living present Christian community and its historic heritage other than within the pages of the Bible. This does not mean that the Bible, particularly the New Testament, will not be taught. But the church should not be forced to spend all its time acquainting children with elementary facts which they have a right to receive from their home culture.

And what does Professor Knox mean when he says that he wants his son to "think of God"? We do too, but his use of the term is suspect because of the psychological term "to condition" in his paragraph above. Must the church accept this unspiritual view of human nature and of learning as a basis for its educa-

tional program? The theory of conditioning fits marvelously with Hitler's view of man and with his program. But that a professor of Christian preaching should want to accept such a psychological base, and equate his son with Watson's rats and Pavlov's salivating dogs!

Winnetka, Ill. ROSS SNYDER.

Pacifists Feel No 'Plight'

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: May I as a pacifist minister of the United Church of Canada reply to the letter of my fellow minister Dr. A. L. Smith in your issue of October 25? Dr. Smith is wasting his sympathy. The so-called "plight of the pacifists" exists only in the imagination of those who would like to see us abjure our principles now that our country is at war. May I assure Dr. Smith that the pledge we took was based upon something which we consider so eternally right that no recent literature can cause us to reject it. Our attitude to war is not determined by Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, but by Jesus' gospel. If we did take our principles from Hitler, I suppose we would have to rewrite not only the parable of the Good Samaritan but also the Sermon on the Mount. As it is, we are able to accept both as Jesus gave them to us.

West United Church, CLARENCE HALLIDAY.
Montreal, Que.

It 'Ouches!'

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: Keep right on speaking out the truth. It "ouches!" It may even lose you a few subscribers, but it is the rudder of the Kingdom. Many of us turn to The Christian Century as to an oracle in these troubled times. We don't always agree with you, either, but we're not quitting. We say you are on the right track, and we add, "Don't trim your sails to the wind!" It will be an evil day for you when all praise you.

Faneuil Congregational Church, AARON N. MECKEL.
Brighton, Mass.

From the Japanese Churches

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: It was with a deep sense of regret that we read the article entitled "The Japanization of Christianity" in the August 2 issue of your paper—not because of the criticisms of us but because the argument is based on misapprehension and false premises.

We believe that it is quite natural for Christians of every nation to express their faith according to the respective backgrounds of their inherited culture. You might call it either the nationalization of Christianity or the Christianization of national culture; and it is highly desirable that the Christianity developing in any nation should show national characteristics in its forms of expression and that they should be somewhat different from the forms transplanted from foreign nations, just as the same seed growing in a different soil and different climate shows variations. The criticisms against Christianity in mission fields hitherto have been of its foreignness and that it does not well adapt itself to the life of a nation, but now on the contrary it is criticized for being nationalized. Well, misunderstandings may be inevitable at the present when the whole national life is mobilized to the vital issue of the life or death of the nation.

The article above mentioned is ascribed to "A Japanese Witness," and you state in the "who's who" that he is a Japanese Christian minister. We wonder if you have his name and can be positive that he is a Japanese subject. We must say that we cannot understand his psychology, if he be a real Japanese. He alluded to a certain Japanese writer as the only brave man who has been persecuted in fighting for peace. This is an entirely mistaken report, as the attack on Mr. Osaka occurred long before the present China incident and rose from an entirely different matter not connected with Christianity at all. The writer's illustrations from Japanese history are also highly imaginative. He does not know the actual situation of our Christian movement here; e.g., he calls our National Christian Council the "Church Federation Council." Moreover, the entire tone is more American than Japanese.

Different backgrounds tend to create a different psychological attitude. We Japanese Christians are in a different environment from our Christian brethren in America. In your country the church existed prior to the state and the government was organized for the people and by the people, whereas we Christians in Japan became converted out of the long established traditional national heritage. This difference of background often makes it difficult for each to understand the other's point of view. The author of the article does not really understand the standpoint of our Japanese Christians. That being the case, it is most unfortunate that he passes judgment so dogmatically.

We wish to call your attention also to the correspondence in your August 30 issue. We appreciate your printing the letter of Dr. Walter M. Buchanan. We believe that he represents those people who have a fair attitude. However, we felt very sorry to see Rev. C. K. Imbrie's letter in the same issue, which is unfair to Dr. Kagawa. His cable messages were sent to you and to the other American friends entirely on his own initiative. We Christians well understand his motive in sending such messages. It is entirely unjust and unfair to accuse him of being a propaganda agent.

We believe that you are trying to help bring the Kingdom of God on earth through your valuable pages; and so we cannot help requesting you to refrain from making use of an article by some irresponsible writer, based on such unreliable data.

Tokyo, Japan. MICHIO KOZAKI,
SOICHI SAITO,
YOSHIMUNE ABE,
TAMEICHIRO KANAI,
AKIRA EBISAWA.
Special Committee Appointed by the National Christian Council of Japan.

[The author of the article in question was a Japanese Christian, properly vouched for by responsible parties known to us. —THE EDITORS.]

Control at Amsterdam

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: Dr. Visser 't Hooft, in commenting on "the wholly inaccurate and misleading picture" which he says Dick Baker gave you of the World Christian Youth Conference, made a few mistakes himself. If the decision to have no resolutions or statements on current affairs was reached one year before the conference, why weren't the delegates informed of it? Does Visser 't Hooft consider such a decision democratic, when the youth protested? When we delegates started to ask questions, *at Amsterdam,* we were hushed up by the statement that the international situation would not bear disturbance, particularly because of the difficulty surrounding the holding of the conference. Why wasn't the matter handled frankly and openly?

The criticism we directed against the split communions was that the delegates themselves were never consulted in the matter. Here again there was no frank discussion. The basic reason for it was the one Baker originally gave: that to Visser 't Hooft a youth conference is one *for* youth, to us in America it is one in which the youth have some of the say.

It was very generous of the governing group to permit six daily chairmen under thirty to take the platform, and to see to it that their presence seemed visibly to imply a youth conference. But who did the appointing, the governing? We delegates all know that it wasn't the daily chairmen of the morning worship service! But none of us knows who it was.

In fact who did run the youth conference to which we were invited delegates, anyhow?

New York, N. Y. FRANKLIN H. LITTELL.

[With this letter, correspondence on the Amsterdam Conference is closed.—THE EDITORS.]

NEWS *of the* CHRISTIAN WORLD

Chicago Pastors Favor Embargo

Neutrality 'Pretense' Assailed by Presbyterian Minister—Illinois Baptists in Convention—Social Workers Meet

(Correspondence from Chicago)

CHICAGO, Oct. 30.—Probably by the time this appears in print final action will have been taken by the House as it already has been taken by the Senate on the proposal to repeal the arms embargo. The question has been hotly debated in Chicago recently. Forces opposed to repeal have been exerting considerable pressure through the churches and it would seem that the majority of ministers who have expressed themselves have favored the retention of the arms embargo as a bulwark against our ultimate involvement in the war. Drs. Ernest Fremont Tittle of Evanston, Albert Buckner Coe of Oak Park and Harold L. Bowman of Chicago so expressed themselves on "Peace-makers' Sunday," Oct. 22.

Opposing views also found expression. Rev. Theodore C. Hume, pastor of New England Congregational Church, declared in favor of repealing the embargo, but the most outspoken expression was probably that of Dr. Clinton C. Cox, of Drexel Park Presbyterian Church, who asked, "Why this pretense about neutrality when we know who ought to win? We want England and France to win, not as nations, but as those who represent our ideals of democracy and religion." The majority of ministers however refuse to make any public statement, since the matter in their judgment has become largely a political issue.

Probably that was the chief reason why the Illinois Baptist state convention at its meeting held in Carbondale last week tabled a quite mild resolution which, while omitting all reference to the arms embargo, asked the government to avoid all legislation which might result in America's ultimate involvement in war. The *Minister,* a Baptist journal published in Chicago, came out in its last issue with a leading editorial favoring repeal of the embargo.

* * *

Illinois Baptists Convene

Under the presidency of Rev. W. C. Rutherford, of Rockford, the Illinois Baptist state convention held its annual meeting at Carbondale, as already intimated, Oct. 16-19. A feature of the convention was the installation of Dr. Ralph G. Schell, formerly pastor of Second Baptist Church, Chicago, as executive secretary. The keynote address was given by Dean Charles W. Gilkey, of Chicago. A statement on the task of the churches in a world at war, presented at a forum session of the convention and ordered to be printed and distributed to all Baptist pastors in the state, urged that while all efforts should be made to keep America out of war, care should be taken that this course be not dictated by selfish motives; strengthening of missionary endeavor as the supreme expression of Christian internationalism was proposed, as well as participation in ministries of mercy to war sufferers, opposition to hatred, moral support for conscientious objectors, study of the conditions of enduring peace and a better international order, humility and repentance for our own part in creating conditions out of which war arises, and the proclamation that where choices must be made the first allegiance of Christians must be given to Christ.

Carl H. Weber, of Springfield, a prominent layman, was elected president for the ensuing year, and the offices of the convention were ordered moved from Bloomington to Springfield.

* * *

Relief Payments Increased

Payments to the 100,000 Chicago families on relief will be increased from 65 per cent to 80 per cent of minimum requirements for the month of November, according to an announcement just made by Leo M. Lyons, relief commissioner. This is better but by no means adequate. Meanwhile tens of thousands of downstate families suffer bitter need.

* * *

Social Workers Gather

Fifteen hundred persons, representing all branches of public and private welfare work, assembled in this city for the 44th annual convention of the Illinois Conference on Social Welfare, which closed its sessions Oct. 19. A memorial service to the late Miss Grace Abbott was a feature of the sessions. Resolutions passed affirmed the convention's opposition to discrimination against minority groups, and advocated extension and strengthening of the merit system in civil service, a special session of the legislature to make sufficient funds for relief available immediately for the entire state, a coordinated welfare system with state supervision and cash aid, legislation for aid to dependent children and to the blind, amendment to the old age assistance act to provide adequate medical care, a national health program to aid low income families, and improved service to mental patients in state hospitals.

* * *

Pastoral Changes, Church Anniversaries

Rev. H. R. Brinker, rector of St. Bartholomew's Episcopal Church, has been elected Bishop of Nebraska.

Rev. Clarence N. Wright, for nearly nine years one of the ministers of Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, has been called to the pastorate of the Ravenswood Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Donald Harrington was ordained and inducted into the pastorate of the People's Liberal Church of Chicago on Sunday evening, Oct. 22.

First Episcopal Church, Morgan Park, Rev. G. Carlton Story, rector, celebrated its golden jubilee Oct. 22. Elmhurst Congregational and Bethel Lutheran churches also celebrated 50 years of service last week.

CHARLES T. HOLMAN.

Religion First, Says N. Y. Body

State Chamber of Commerce Sees 'Great Lack' in Education—Leaders Study Sunday School Decline

(Correspondence from New York)

NEW YORK, Oct. 30.—A special committee on public education reported to the New York state chamber of commerce at its October meeting. The entire paper presented by the committee was most profound but it was especially striking in that it put religion as the first prerequisite for public education. The statement read in part:

"Accordingly, we place *first* on our list of things that are necessary to produce 'the schools New York state wants' a deep, true, religious understanding and viewpoint. . . . This committee is convinced that the great lack in our homes and in our national life is the lack of true, simple religion. . . . In these work-a-day, warring, strenuous times, we have been paying less and less attention to our religious convictions and feelings. . . . If this nation does not maintain its religious foundation, its whole structure will fail. . . . The United States cannot have or maintain a right system unless it is based on true, religious principles, and therefore, in spite of the fact that some hesitate to include religion in our educational program, we place it first."

Thus, New York's chamber of commerce has challenged the church to action upon the very basic convictions it professes.

* * *

Forward Movement in Christian Education

A potentially important meeting was held during luncheon at the Republican Club when 65 prominent ministers and laymen gathered to hear a report of six committees appointed a year ago to study the question of decreasing Sunday school membership and interest. Mr. W. W. Hall, a leading business man of the city, instigated the movement last fall when a smaller group were his luncheon guests at the same club.

The main emphases stressed were: fellowship, worship and trained leadership in church schools, a closer tie-up with public education and private schools, more study and resulting change of program for racial and shifting population groups, and emphasis on the home.

Rev. Elmore M. McKee of St. George's Episcopal Church presided and Rev. Phillip Jones of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church acted as the general chairman of the reporting committees. Rev. Walter M. Howlett of the Greater New York federation of churches acted as executive secretary for the meeting and the follow-up program which was definitely voted.

* * *

Weekday Schools to Teach Brotherhood

Two hundred and twenty-six weekday schools of religion have opened in New

York city during the past two weeks. Because there is no released time these schools are held after public school hours. It is significant that the courses of study provided "combat the propaganda of hatred and misunderstanding which are so prevalent today, with the positive Christian principles of love and brotherhood." Special emphasis is given to interracial and interfaith appreciation. Visits to Jewish synagogues, interchurch visits of racial classes and peace pageants are among the activities definitely arranged for in the curriculum outlines. The entire program for the city is under the guidance of a central committee of which Frederick Westphal, a public school principal, is chairman, and which consists of representatives of the three federations of churches in Brooklyn, New York and Queens, and the Protestant Teachers Association.

* * *

Methodists Hold Retreat

The Methodist ministers of the New York and Syracuse areas "retreated" to the Thayer Hotel, West Point, for a three-day conference last Tuesday to Thursday. The program was based on the premise that "science, socialism, dictators, armies and every other device has failed. The church as she truly and potently interprets Christ's life and channels supernatural power is the world's only hope."

The galaxy of noted speakers included Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Bishop Charles W. Flint, Bishop Paul Kern, Gipsy Smith, Prof. Georgia Harkness and Dean A. B. Kinsolving, 2nd. Dr. Clarence T. Craig of Oberlin led a significant series of Bible studies. Nearly 300 ministers attended from five surrounding states. Dr. Christian F. Reisner, of Broadway Temple Methodist Church, Manhattan, acted as executive chairman of the committee.

* * *

Use of Force Voted by Bible Classes

A major of the Reserve Corps presented a rather startling resolution to the New York state federation of men's Bible classes meeting in the Park Central Hotel. The resolution—which was passed without debate—condemned "military atheists" as they "persecute and annihilate religious groups, and rob, plunder and kill other so-called Christian nations and the Christians within them." It concluded with the words: "We resolve . . . to defend our Lord, his principles and his people, whether by word or force."

* * *

And So Forth

It is good news that Rev. L. Bradford Young has fully recovered from the operation upon his eye. He preached his last sermon Sunday in Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, where he has been the assistant pastor for 13 years. He goes to Manchester, N. H., as rector of Grace Protestant Episcopal Church.

Five great money raising campaigns are going on in the city: United Hospital appeal for $2,462,618; Manhattan-Bronx Y.M.C.A., $1,490,109; Community Service Society of N. Y., $535,000; New York and Brooklyn-Queens Y.W.C.A.'s, $229,000; Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, $125,000. At the same time the Red Cross roll call is taking place.

J. Henry Carpenter.

Disciples Stirred By World Events

International Convention Calls Traffic in Arms Unchristian—Need for Christian Unity Stressed

(Special Correspondence)

Richmond, Oct. 26.—The first major religious convention in this country since the start of the present European war has been held here during the last week by the Disciples of Christ. Every day during which this International Convention was in session proved mildly warm and almost cloudless. Richmond is famous as a convention city, and the hospitality of the old south was abundantly demonstrated. The accommodations of the convention hall, the Mosque, were the most complete and satisfactory ever experienced by this religious group. The registration of delegates and visitors was the largest since the Disciples' world convention in Washington in 1930. There were 2,998 registrations and the total attendance was estimated at well above 5,000.

World Tension Felt

It soon became evident that this convention was meeting under a sense of the changed and changing world conditions. First of all, there was an atmosphere of possibly impending catastrophe. Missionaries were present who had just come out of the war-torn regions of China where they had hazarded their lives for the sake of serving their fellow men in the name of Christ. Others had been shipwrecked when they were passengers aboard the ill-fated Athenia. Here were medical missionaries whose hospitals had been bombed by Japanese airplanes and utterly destroyed, with patients, nurses and doctors losing their lives. All this gave to the convention an awareness of the perils in the world.

There developed also a sense of wider, cosmic outlook upon the conditions and the problems of our time. Dr. Roger T. Nooe, president of the International Convention, in his address on the opening night, said: "It is our faith that if Christians throughout the world had been more aware of the infinite worth of human life, more sensitive to human suffering and frustration, more committed to the rule of God in every realm of life, our world tonight would not be in shambles. Neither would the twin evils of unemployment and poverty be so rife in our own land of plenty. We have been living in a Ptolemaic moral system. Now by forces that may prove to be our friends we are thrust out into a Copernican society that, not knowing its center, is terrified by its circumference." In an address before a large group at a Christian unity luncheon Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison carried forward this cosmic outlook, developed some of its implications and showed its effect upon Disciple thinking and upon our relation to the developing World Council of Churches.

Dean Sperry Speaks

Dean W. L. Sperry, of Harvard Divinity School, said: "I see no reason why the Christian conscience requires us to go on being duped perpetually by liars. . . . Your adversary meets you alert to deny in theory the validity of the principles upon which you propose to appeal to him. . . . What we are to do in the face of the present situation is, for Christians, a moral problem of the first magnitude. . . . I put down the loss of theoretically binding moral universals in Christendom as the major problem of our time."

Mrs. Margueritte Harmon Bro, speaking at a banquet of 800 called together by editors of the magazine *World Call*, indicated the factors which in our time play upon us in "The Making Up of Our Minds," and showed how world-wide and inescapable are the forces of propaganda.

Urge to Christian Unity

A third element in the sense of a changing world order which pervaded this convention was the urge toward Christian unity. This note was sounded repeatedly. Dr. Nooe stressed it in his presidential address.

Rev. Alden Lee Hill, of Los Angeles, held that the New Testament furnishes neither authority nor precedent for the existence of separate religious bodies or denominations, not even for our own so-called "communion" of the Disciples of Christ, whether spelled with a big or a little "D." In meeting the new problems of today, Dean Sperry said that Christians throughout the world must unite their efforts and turn from the multiple "Christ of the creeds" to the universal Jesus of history. Dr. George A. Buttrick, president of the Federal Council of Churches, said: "The Protestant church is still in the era of the little red schoolhouse as over against the splendid township high school. The church will rise to its maximum effectiveness when the separated groups are united."

The plea and prayer for world peace found frequent utterance throughout the sessions of the convention. Dr. Roswell Barnes, associate secretary of the department of international justice and good will of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, declared that the task of the Christian church in the world today is to promote the feeling of brotherhood among men of all nations. Following the meeting at which he spoke a large number of those present signed a resolution calling for action by the convention with regard to conscientious objectors to war and to war propaganda.

Arms Trade Condemned

The most outstanding protagonist for peace and against war was Miss Muriel Lester of London, England. She declared that European statesmen seemed to be "bankrupt of ideas" to find a way out of the present trouble. Speaking to women, she declared that this is the first war which has been preceded by a long period during which women have been able to vote. She pleaded that women "refuse to lift up one finger in the support of war." Dr. Buttrick expressed the conviction that goodness in the world cannot be stamped out, but will continue to live, despite wars. He discounted "political hope," saying that "we got rid of the Kaiser, but raised up a Hitler. And we may get rid of Hitler and raise up a Kaiser."

Resolutions condemning the 'manufacture and trade in munitions and arms as "unchristian and destructive of lives and property" were introduced and adopted by

the convention, but not by unanimous vote. Opposition was raised to certain sections on the ground that members of the churches are employed in the manufacture and the sale of articles which may be considered at least contributory to munitions and arms and that these resolutions if carried into effect would throw such persons out of legitimate employment. Delegates from the mining regions of Pennsylvania objected on the ground that the mining of coal might be so considered. It was said that working men are not ready to walk out of such jobs and throw their families upon public charity. The text of the resolution adopted reads as follows:

"Whereas, as Christians we are opposed to all attempts to use war as an instrument of national policy, and

"Whereas, the manufacture of or trade in munitions and arms is a form of encouragement of and participation in war for profit, therefore be it

"Resolved, that we condemn the traffic in arms and munitions of war as unchristian and destructive of lives and property.

"We urge that members of our churches who are employed in the manufacture and commerce of munitions and arms seek other employment; that members who receive income from the same source dispose of their investments.

"We urge that churches and church agencies announce that they do not desire to receive income from investments from the manufacture of or the trade in arms or munitions. We state here what we believe to be an application of an enduring Christian principle. We recognize that there may be difference of opinion on the application of this principle to specific situations. We request that the department of social education and social action of the United Christian Missionary Society use its facilities to get our churches and church agencies to act in accordance with this resolution."

The committee on recommendations recommended the approval of this resolution. On the floor of the convention the resolution was divided into two sections, the first of which was adopted practically by unanimous vote; but the second portion by a vote of 108 to 77.

Call for Increased Employment

Another resolution touching the war situation reads as follows: "Whereas, widespread unemployment and the misery resulting therefrom tends to create disillusionment and despair which in time of crisis may cause men to turn to war in order to take advantage of high commodity prices, high wages and increased employment for older men resulting from the entry of younger workers into the military service, therefore: be it resolved that this International Convention of the Disciples of Christ urge its members and citizens generally to do everything possible to increase employment, provide adequate wages and promote economic security for the millions of jobless workers in the United States." This resolution was recommended by the committee on recommendations for approval and was adopted by the convention.

Other important resolutions were adopted relating to fraternal relations with other communions, to steps toward Christian union, and to cooperation in the developing World Council of Churches.

F. W. BURNHAM.

√ A Handy Check List of Highly Useful COKESBURY GOOD BOOKS

√ THE FINE ART OF PUBLIC WORSHIP
By ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD

"Professor Blackwood's contribution lies in the fact that he approaches the subject from the point of view of an historian. . . . The place to begin, the first source, for public worship is the Bible. Professor Blackwood rightly begins here. But he goes on to the very practical application . . . to the needs of the modern parish. He gently but authoritatively puts his finger on the weakest spots in the average worship service of the average church."—*Unity.*

$2

√ THE CHAPEL PRAYER BOOK
By JOHN HENRY FRIZZELL

● "The author of this volume is chaplain of Pennsylvania State College, where voluntary chapel has developed into a significant and largely attended service. . . . These prayers are in no sense academic nor is their usefulness limited to student audiences. They may profitably be used wherever prayer is used, and will perhaps be most serviceable in private devotions and as an aid to preparation for public prayer."—*Christian Century.*

● "Not many ministers would be without the *Chapel Prayer Book* if they could learn what the book is, in the quality and range of the prayers."—*Halford E. Luccock.*

$1

√ THE ART OF COUNSELING
By ROLLO MAY

● "Short, well written, and well organized. . . . It deals in a direct way with the problems which re-occur in counseling situations."—*Monday Morning.*

● "Every college and high school dean, every minister, every teacher, and every parent can profit by it greatly in practical ways. The persons with whom they 'counsel' will profit even more, and the counseling that is now being done by some leaders will be completely made over."—*Sociology and Social Research.*

$2

√ The Minister: His World and His Work
By William Adams Brown

"No one is better qualified to discuss the work of the minister, his tasks and his problems, than the author of this book. . . . It has the appeal and directness of a personal conference. . . . Its clarifying interpretations of the distinct work of the Church in the modern world should do much to increase understanding, and to strengthen an intelligent support. It candidly examines outstanding questions of popular interest . . . and throughout there is an apprehension of the unique contribution of religion."—*Review of Religion.*

Now, $1

√ The World's Religions A Short History
By Chas. S. Braden

"One of the most readable and comprehensive accounts of 'the world's religions' now available anywhere. . . . In the chronological order of their origins, the author tells the main facts about the religions of primitive peoples, of the ancient civilizations, of northern and southern Europe, and of the Near and Far East. Every chapter has been written objectively, and in a scientific spirit. The book is crammed with pertinent facts—social, economic, political, literary."—*Zion's Herald.*

$1.50

√ A COMPLETE INDEX TO THE THOUGHT AND TEACHINGS OF CHRIST
By W. S. Harris

Alphabetically and topically arranged, the index cites instantly to the user any desired reference to the Gospel sources of Christ's teachings, opinions, or verdicts on a thousand significant themes. "It ought to be in easy reach of the preacher, teacher, or Bible student. . . . Unique, but practical."—*Religious Telescope.* "A useful tool."—*Christian Century.*

$1.50

Send for Fall Catalogue

COKESBURY PRESS Nashville *At Your Bookstore*

"All are delighted

with *The New Church Hymnal.* Liturgic section the best I have seen. Enthusiastic about the hymns with descants. There is new interest in the church service."

Rev. Roy Martin Houghton, Pastor, Church of Christ (Congregational) Milford, Connecticut

THE NEW CHURCH HYMNAL

Edited by Four Great Leaders in the Church

H. Augustine Smith
Edward Shippen Barnes
Howard Chandler Robbins
James Dalton Morrison

527 hymns, tunes, and chants
72 pages of worship material

A fine balance of the old and the new

Attractive and durable in printing and binding

Returnable Copies for Examination on Request

Price $110 per hundred

D. APPLETON-CENTURY COMPANY
35 West 32nd Street
New York City

Premier Says No To Hitler Peace

British Public Supports Chamberlain in Holding Führer's Word Worthless—Pacifists Ask Conference

(Correspondence from England)

London, Oct. 13 (Delayed).—Yesterday in Parliament the prime minister answered the speech Herr Hitler made in the Reichstag last week. As all the world expected he said "No" to the proposals which the German government had made. The conditions which were laid down he found impossible and dishonorable.

In the debate which followed it was made clear that an overwhelming mass of support was on his side. Voices were raised, not indeed in defense of Hitlerism but in support of an attempt to call a world conference which might consider the problems now before the nations. Mr. Lansbury, for example, appealed to President Roosevelt and the King of the Belgians to make one more supreme effort to bring the nations together. Such an appeal has had the support of pacifist statesmen and ministers of religion. They have made their position clear with courage and ability, but they would not claim to represent the general mind of the nation at this moment.

That mind has lost all confidence in such a "peace" as Hitler proposes. It is considered as only a truce before the next war and no trust is put—how could it be?—in the words of Hitler. This being so, the conditions of a world conference—which must be held sometime—are not supplied. Hitler is said still to block the way. But whether he is retreating "before an enemy turned ally, and an ally turned master" we have yet to learn. The Russian enigma is still there.

* * *

Harvests and The War

The harvest for this year is said to yield "fair but not spectacular crops of corn." Potatoes are plentiful, and in general we grow all the potatoes we need. The critics of our beet-growing are probably glad after all that the home-grown beet crop, if it comes up to expectation, will provide a full quarter of our requirements in sugar. But more important than the harvest of 1939 is that of 1940. The minister of agriculture has asked for 1,500,000 acres of grassland to be plowed, and there is reason to believe that this will be done. This will mean a welcome increase in food production. In addition to this important program it is hoped that there will be 500,000 more allotments; an allotment is a small piece of ground on which for a very small rental an ordinary householder can grow his own vegetables. Under the useful slogan, "Dig for Victory," we are exhorted to join in this enterprise. These additional allotments would provide potatoes and vegetables that would feed a million adults for eight months out of twelve. The habit was acquired by many citizens during the years 1914-18, and was never lost.

* * *

Evacuation and Other Internal Problems

Stories go round about the children from great cities who are now in the country. There are stories of misfits, and of discomforts endured by the hosts of these "guests of safety." Not enough has been made of the advantages not only in physical health but in the discovery by the town child that "he is a personality, not a mere item in a great crowd." And if there have been misfits, on the other hand there have been beautiful and encouraging things which I am sure far exceed the annoyances.

The Bishop of Salisbury has done a real service in recording his impressions of the pleasure which these children have brought to their hosts. Much is being done to provide them with books; their teachers are acting almost in a pastoral relation to their wards. Of such things I can speak, as hosts of others can, from my own recent experiences.

* * *

Committee to Advise on Aid for Adolescents

A constructive plan for welfare work on behalf of the youth of the nation has been prepared by 12 national bodies acting together through the Conference of National Juvenile Organizations. The strain of war falls very heavily on adolescents, in their spiritual as well as in their physical development. There is to be a National Youth Committee appointed by the minister of education to advise the government on this subject.

* * *

Look to Dr. Göbbels for Comic Relief

There is little light relief in times of war. It must be admitted that some of it comes from German propaganda. It never occurred to us before that Mr. Squeers and Quilp, those somewhat unreal villains in Dickens, are typical Englishmen revealing the national character. I wish they had selected Pickwick.

Edward Shillito.

[Dr. Shillito's previous letter, dated Oct. 5, reached the editorial offices in the same mail with the letter printed above, both having been delayed by the censor.—The Editors.]

If you are looking for enlightenment rather than excitement in the treatment of current world events, may we suggest that you try an acquaintance subscription to The Christian Century—17 weeks for $1.

The Christian Century
440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago
Please send The Christian Century for 17 weeks. Enclosed $1.00.

Name_____

Address_____

Pacifist Revolt Stirs Canada

Seventy Ministers Publish Manifesto Rejecting War—United Church Leaders Deeply Regret Action

(Correspondence from Ontario)

TORONTO, Oct. 26.—The church in Canada finds itself divided by pacifist agitation. The attorney general of Ontario has ordered investigation of the action of some 70 ministers of the United Church in publishing what they called "A Witness Against the War." Does this contravene the law providing for the defense of the realm by discouraging recruiting? If so, prosecution of the signatories will be seriously considered. What does the church say about the matter?

Unfortunately we have not a clear issue. The signatories include some of the ablest and most devoted of the younger ministers, several of whom served in the First World War. A few highly respected senior pastors may also be found in the group. The document emphasized the declarations of the Oxford Conference and of the General Council of the United Church of Canada that "war is contrary to the mind of Christ," the latter body having said also that "we absolutely reject war because war rejects love." Full recognition is given to the fact that two courses of action are admittedly open to the Christian but the signatories give reasons why they feel bound to refuse any direct form of military action. Had the document rested the case there on the absolute incompatibility of war with Christian life, probably nothing would have happened; but others whose names have been withheld would have signed the statement.

* * *

Declare All Nations Share in Responsibility for War

The "Witness Against the War" went on to declare inability to "approve this war" and to discuss the rather questionable story of international policy during recent years. Perhaps chief offense was given by the statement that "we find that no nation is black or white but all share in responsibility for creating the situation which makes war inevitable." Nonetheless, the signatories affirmed that other Christians did not share their view and that they spoke only for themselves and others who were ready to add their names to the document. Did this constitute an invitation to join in concerted resistance to the civil authority? Many recognized that the right conscientiously to refuse participation in war must be maintained so far as one's conscience governed one's own action. But does this include the right to agitate and invite others to defeat the national will once war has been entered upon? Naturally enough the press gave much publicity to the "Witness," accompanying it with insinuations against the patriotism and sometimes the mental capacity of the writers.

In the emergency thus created the subexecutive of the General Council met to consider whether some clarification of the position of the church should be attempted. This committee revealed sharp conflict of opinion and considerable intensity of feeling. After several hours of conversation this official body issued a finding.

* * *

General Council Cites Loyalty of Church

The committee recognized that their task was to set forth the actual attitude of the United Church to the war rather than to pronounce judgment on the views proclaimed in the manifesto. To this end they deprecated the publicity given to an entirely unofficial statement and as better evidence of the mind of the church mentioned the fact that almost every presbytery has met since the opening of the war and considered the situation; but "that no one of these bodies expressed itself in the terms or spirit of the manifesto. On the contrary resolutions expressing loyalty have been adopted." Complaint is already heard that the committee failed to cite the formal attitude of the church as declared by General Council which "absolutely rejected war because it rejects love." Nothing said by the signatories went beyond the sharp assertions of the church courts, and to ignore this misrepresents the mind of the church.

* * *

Criticize Signatories Of Manifesto

The committee pointed out also that 150 of the ministers have volunteered for chaplain services, and that a special committee was set up to promote different forms of war service by church groups. In view of these facts the committee was confident that it expressed the mind of the church in regretting "the action of the signatories in making the manifesto public." The church is "determined to defend individual conscience," but in "acting collectively and inviting signatures for later publication the signatories of this manifesto, however sincere, have gone far beyond the limits of what is wise and proper in time of war. Even the appearance of organizing opinion against the tragic necessities of the community cannot but jeopardize the essential unity and fellowship both of the church and of the nation." The findings of the committee close with a declaration of the loyalty of the United Church to his majesty and its steady purpose to "support him in the present dire struggle in every way which is open to the church."

* * *

Tension Relieved In Quebec

It should be remembered that the incident occurred while the nation was trembling with fear that the province of Quebec was about to reelect a cabinet whose policy menaced the confederate unity of the nation, especially by opposition to full participation in the war. Today, to everyone's surprise, the province has by a majority of almost five to one swept that cabinet from office, and now the tension is relieved. This anxiety had something to do with the nervousness aroused by the manifesto.

* * *

More to Come, Is Belief

What next? Will the signatories remain silent or insist that the suppression of reference to General Council action and belief has rendered them injustice? Will the

BOOKS

By Contemporary Scholars

GOD IN OUR STREET
GEORGE STEWART

"Shows what theology means for the man of the street, the common man. It would be fine if pastors could secure books like this, first for their own use, then to pass around among their laymen. Better still if they could persuade the laymen to purchase them."—*The Garrett Tower.*

"The treatment of the three personages of the Godhead . . . is marked by an unexpected though welcome brevity. It is distinguished by logic, pointedness, and aptness of illustration."—*Presbyterian Tribune.*

$2.00

ORIGINS OF THE GOSPELS
FLOYD V. FILSON

"It is not too much to say that there is no better summary of the present state of Gospel study than this book presents."—*Christendom.*

"A capable American scholar deals not merely with form criticism but with all the recent phases of gospel criticism. He brings the reader up to date on the problems of textual criticism and of the synoptic relationships as well."—*Harvard Divinity School Bulletin.*

$2.00

JESUS AND HIS CHURCH
R. NEWTON FLEW

"With fascinating exegetical skill the author shows how the racial community of Israel passed into the super-racial community of the New Israel, and how the consciousness of the church as a living community chosen of God runs consistently through the whole New Testament."—*Christian Century Pulpit.*

"For all who seek a thoughtful and scholarly work on the meaning of the church, not only for present enlightenment, but for future reference, this book will be very welcome."—*Review and Expositor.*

$2.00

JOHN WESLEY
FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

"An intellectual and spiritual distillation of all that lies in the vast range of Wesleyan writings. It is a masterpiece of its kind, but is not to be appreciated by anyone who is devoid of some previous knowledge of Wesley and his times. It will be supremely enjoyed by one who has done some ranging in this field and now settles down to follow the guidance of one who knows every bypath and corner of its vast extent."—John Haynes Holmes, in *Unity.*

$3.00

At the Better Bookshops

THE ABINGDON PRESS

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO
Boston Pittsburgh San Francisco
Detroit Kansas City Portland, Ore.

civil authorities appreciate that the explicit declaration of the committee will render unnecessary any further action to discourage such public utterances? Meanwhile the committee criticized only the publication and organized action, not the views expressed. One hardly dare hope that the last has been heard of the matter.

ERNEST THOMAS.

PULPIT & CHOIR GOWNS

Pulpit Hangings—Altar Cloths
Bible Markers—Communion Linens
Custom Tailoring for Clergymen

Visit our showroom when in New York

COX SONS & VINING, INC.
131 EAST 23rd STREET, NEW YORK

Choir Pulpit GOWNS

Fine materials, beautiful work, pleasingly low prices. Catalog and samples on request. State your needs and name of church.

DeMoulin Bros. & Co.
1187 South 4th St., Greenville, Ill.

THE ROYAL ROAD TO MEXICO

By WILLIAM C. S. PELLOWE

A Guide-book; an Interpretation
170 pages, 25 illustrations
Order of any bookstore, $1.00

City and Church In Transition

By MURRAY H. LEIFFER

Approved

"A valuable contribution to all who are concerned with the future of America, which more and more is becoming urban-minded."—*Presbyterian Tribune.*

"A rich treasure of information for city pastors."—*Review and Expositor.*

"May stir pastors to the challenge of leadership demanded by this day of transition."—*The Churchman.*

"Readable and interesting . . . sociologically sound."—*World Call.*

$2.50

A WILLETT-CLARK Book

'Y' Would Serve In War Crisis

National Council Calls to Sober Thinking—Conference Discusses Delinquency—Dr. Gleiss Dies

(Correspondence from Detroit)

DETROIT, Oct. 21.—When the National Council of the Y.M.C.A. opens its three-day session in Detroit on Oct. 26 the 400 lay delegates and "Y" secretaries in attendance will be giving careful and sober thought to the part the Y.M.C.A. can play in the present world situation. John Foster Dulles, New York attorney and author, will discuss "America's Role in the Present Situation." Proposals for a campaign to promote "sober thinking" on the European war by "Y" members will be made, and the problem of serving the youth affected by the war will be discussed in one of the council's sessions. Among the speakers scheduled to address the sessions are Harper Sibley, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches; Eugene E. Barrett, executive secretary of the "Y" international board of directors; J. L. Hromadka, former Czech leader now serving as exchange professor at Princeton University; David Toong, "Y" secretary at Peiping, China; and James K. Quay, "Y" secretary at Cairo, Egypt. Cleveland E. Dodge of New York will be toastmaster, and Elmore M. McKee, rector of St. George's Episcopal Church in New York city, will conduct all devotional services.

* * *

Conference Wrestles with Delinquency Problem

"We are here today because the church has failed in its duty. It has delegated to the courts what lay within its special province." These are the words of Rev. Scott MacDonald of Lansing, a member of the Michigan council of churches, and they were addressed to the delegates attending the third annual Michigan delinquency prevention conference held Oct. 14 in Saginaw. Rev. F. L. Fraser, of the First Baptist Church in Saginaw, declared that the seriousness of the present delinquency problem was due in part to the failure of law enforcement agencies and child welfare services to enlist the church in the fight. Rev. Carl S. Winters of Jackson, chairman of the Michigan Juvenile Corrections Commission, predicted a 50 per cent increase in crime within a decade if present tendencies are not checked. The solution, he said, would be found in the home. The council adopted a resolution addressed to the governor, the legislature and county supervisors, asking that juvenile courts and corrective institutions be more adequately supplied with trained psychiatrists and social workers.

* * *

Death of Dr. Gleiss, Baptist Leader

Henry C. Gleiss, for 21 years general superintendent of the Detroit Baptist Union and one of our city's most useful citizens, died Oct. 17 while participating in the Michigan Baptist convention in Lansing. For over 50 years Dr. Gleiss devoted himself to the church and to church work and the evidences of his labors are manifold. In the Detroit area alone he assisted in the establishment of 65 churches, and he was one of the founders of the Detroit council of churches.

* * *

Evangelical Church Centenary

One hundred years ago the first Michigan congregation of the Evangelical Church was organized near Carleton in Monroe county. To commemorate that event the congregations of the Evangelical Church in the Detroit area are holding special services Sunday, Oct. 22. State and national leaders are making a "centennial pilgrimage" through the state under the leadership of Bishop George E. Epp, of Naperville, Ill. Dr. Epp will address a city-wide rally to be held in the Mack Avenue Evangelical Church. A feature of the meeting will be the unveiling of a bronze tablet commemorating the merger of the Evangelical Association and the United Evangelical Church which was consummated in the Mack Avenue Church on Oct. 14, 1922.

WILLIS R. JONES.

Death of Dr. Carl S. Patton

Dr. Carl S. Patton, professor of homiletics at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal., died Oct. 16 after a long illness. In his earlier years Dr. Patton served as minister of Congregational churches in Ann Arbor, Columbus and Los Angeles. In 1929 he became professor of homiletics and practical theology at Chicago Theological Seminary. After three years at this post he returned to the pastorate of First Church in Los Angeles where he had ministered 20 years earlier. In 1933 he went to Berkeley as professor of homiletics. Dr. Patton was moderator of the Congregational National Council 1931-33. He wrote many books of which *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons,* a volume in the Ministers' Professional Library, was the latest.

Major Bowes Gives Estate To Lutherans

Major Edward Bowes, of radio fame, has given his 10-acre estate at Laurel Hill, Westchester county, N. Y., to the Atlantic district of the Missouri synod of the Lutheran Church for use as a retreat center. The estate contains everything that could be desired to house such a center. Major Bowes accompanied the gift with a substantial check to help prepare the estate for its new use.

FOR CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

This interdenominational graduate school of theology is sought by men and women who plan to give their lives to Christian service. Thorough preparation for all types of church leadership. The faculty includes members of six denominations. Degrees offered are A.M., B.D., and S.T.M. Additional opportunities offered by Oberlin College of Arts and Sciences and Conservatory of Music. Catalog.

Thomas W. Graham, D.D., Dean, Oberlin, Ohio

OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Church Adopts Four-Point Plan

Universalists Unify Denominational Program—Convention Considers Liberal Religion in Warring World

(Special Correspondence)

WASHINGTON, D. C., Oct. 21.—Nearly 600 Universalists met in Washington, D. C., Oct. 16-20 in the largest general convention this denomination has had in many years. The major internal concern centered around a four-point plan for the unification of the denominational program. Besides bringing the activities of youth groups, educational societies and women's associations together in a rational pattern, the four-point plan anticipates the expenditure of $100,000 in a carefully surveyed effort to establish new churches in the next four years. The forthright leadership of the general superintendent, Dr. Robert Cummins, received its first test, and the high enthusiasm which greeted his reports caused denominational leaders to feel that a new era is dawning for Universalist enterprise.

* * *

Fuller Cooperation with Other Churches Urged

There was more than a recrudescence of denominational morale, however, for many times during the sessions there was evident an awareness of the movement toward Christian cooperation and unity. The tension felt by left-wing Universalism was expressed by Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, president of the American Unitarian Association, when he said that he did not see how liberals could have close relationships with an ecumenical movement which excluded liberal Jews. "An ecumenical movement with Jesus in it would have to have room for the Jew," said Dr. Eliot.

The convention endeavored to sum up its feelings on the matter in a resolution to the effect that "the Universalist Church declares its sympathy toward that larger Christian purpose which will tend to ally the many denominations of the existing order to build the Kingdom of God. We pledge ourselves unreservedly to the part of helping to promote the fellowship of Christians in which there can be the fullest cooperation with the least necessity of conforming."

* * *

Liberal Religion's Task Today

In the first of two "town meetings," considering "Liberal Religion in the Present World Situation," Bishop Edwin H. Hughes of Washington commented on the recent union of the Methodist Churches: "I am not sure that I favor one church, and only one," he said, "but I am in favor of finding common purposes and uniting our efforts in those." Bishop Hughes made a sharp criticism of "over-intellectualized religion."

Dean Clarence R. Skinner, of the Tufts School of Religion, maintained that liberals in the traditional liberal churches might well be inadequate to carry out the tasks of liberals in the present age. "Liberals are pioneers who are struggling to make explicit the 'unities and the universals' of life," said Dean Skinner. "We are at that stage in history where we need a new burst of the liberal spirit which sees its task as shaping the world to a new and more comprehensive world view."

* * *

Discuss America's Future

In the second of the town meetings, which considered "Religion and Future America," the participants were Dr. F. M. Eliot, Dr. Harry F. Ward and Chancellor J. M. M. Gray of the American University in Washington. Dr. Eliot said liberal religion had four obligations: to formulate an adequate philosophy of liberty for today; to show that freedom is not incompatible with disciplined organization; to apply the methods of religious education in creating incentives for idealism; to have courage to inflict pain, as well as to suffer, in the interests of needed change.

Professor Ward made his approach to the problem of religion in America through a series of questions: 1. Shall we abandon or develop the democratic way of life? 2. Will the United States become a munitions factory for the Allies? Professor Ward outlined three needs as the beginnings of a strategy for liberal religion: 1. Recognize that political and religious freedom are linked together. 2. Take away the sanctions of religion from anti-democratic forces. 3. Realize that the need for bread is connected with the need for brotherhood.

Chancellor Gray said that religion must be a healing, curative force in American life, and not a source of disease and divisiveness.

* * *

Convention Will Back C.O.'s

Significant among the resolutions were four dealing respectively with "conscientious objectors," "gambling," "the cooperative movement" and "international relations." Conscientious objection to war was recognized as having religious standing in the Universalist Church and the convention affirmed the rights of the Universalist conscientious objector.

* * *

U. S. Must Maintain Peace 'To Save Others'

In regard to international relations, the convention veered sharply from the position of the *Christian Leader*, Universalist weekly, which had carried an editorial stating that the United States should help the Allies with men, munitions and supplies of war. The resolution read in part: "We believe the supreme duty of the United States of America is to maintain and strengthen the spirit of good will and democracy in the world. It is our duty to remain at peace, not for the selfish saving of ourselves, but that we may be in a position to serve and save others. We should have no part in the killing of our brother man. Therefore be it resolved, that we urge adoption of such measures as shall keep the United States at peace, and that we condemn as utterly unchristian the making of any profit out of war, and so out of the sin and suffering of others. . . ."

In the closing moments of the convention, Owen D. Young, acting as banquet toastmaster, called upon the liberal church to be ready to be the champion of free-

Tell them the Story of the Bible

602 Pages
234 Stories
32 Color Plates
35 Halftones
Maps
Line Drawings

234 complete stories giving a clear accurate picture of the whole Bible narrative, arranged in proper order from Genesis to Revelation. Recommended by preachers and laymen everywhere.

THROUGH THE BIBLE

Told in simple, understandable language by Theodora Wilson-Wilson in a way that really interests the young. Lovely and striking illustrations in full color by H. M. and C. E. Brock. Avoids doctrinal discussion. Based on King James Version.

Exclusive introductory article on HOW THE BIBLE CAME TO US.

ONLY $2.00

Full cloth binding, picture map endpapers, color jacket. Size 8¾ x 6¼ inches
Send for FREE descriptive Leaflet.

At All Booksellers or from the Publisher
WM. COLLINS SONS & CO.
425 Fourth Avenue New York

THE NEW YORK HOME OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS

1000 Rooms All With Bath
SINGLE $2.50 to $4.00
DOUBLE $4.00 to $7.00
Special Rates to Religious Groups
WRITE FOR BOOKLET "R"

PRINCE GEORGE HOTEL

14 EAST 28TH ST. near 5TH Ave., N. Y.

INVITATION TO FLORIDA!
ORLANDO, the City Beautiful

Within ten minutes of Rollins College at Winter Park.

For delightful apartment or rooms (by week, month or season)

on quiet residential street, near the leading restaurants and entertainment attractions, write

M. H. Scott, 423 East Pine St.
Orlando, Florida

dom in any areas of modern life where human liberty is jeopardized.

* * *

Young Men Control Convention

The leadership of the convention was largely in the hands of young men, although Louis Annin Ames, New York layman who was elected president of the convention, represents the older generation. All active consideration of merging the Universalist Church with some other liberal denomination has subsided, but there is evident a strong desire to cooperate in interdenominational activities.

MAX A. KAPP.

The New Films

These summaries and evaluations are supplied by the National Film Estimate Service. Estimates are for three groups: A, intelligent adults; Y, youth (15-20 years); C, children (under 15 years).

When Germany Surrendered

(World War Documentary) Grim, informative, authentic excerpts from official films by eight nations, on destruction and brutality of war. Czar, Kaiser, Wilson, Clemenceau appear. American deaths shown. Gruesome killings and mutilations. Well meant, pitifully ungrammatical anti-war vocalogue.

For A: Good of kind. For Y: No. For C: No.

Double Crime on the Maginot Line

(French, English titles) Substantial drama of murder and intrigue involving French officer and German wife. Maginot line effective though subordinate background. Plot involved and slow-moving at times, but tense throughout. Excellent acting by French officer.

For A: Depends on taste. For Y: Hardly. For C: No.

Island of Lost Men

(Wong, Naish, Blore) (Para) Mediocre adventure story of man who sets himself up as king of South Sea island and its population of natives and escaped criminals. Innocent persons escape and Naish is killed by natives. Eric Blore adds touch of humor.

For A: Mediocre. For Y: No. For C: No.

Mirele Efros

(Jewish, English titles) Simple, beautifully produced story of a strong, generous woman whose home and business are taken from her by son's ambitious wife. Family later drawn together by grandson. Character of Mirele Efros exquisitely portrayed by able actress.

For A: Excellent of kind. For Y: Mature. For C: No.

The Roaring Twenties

(Cagney, Bogart) (Warner) Prohibition embodied in career of benevolent tough, who returns from war to changed world and no job. Turns racketeer. Backs blues singer but loses her to friend. Tragic ending. Striking use of photomontage and newsreel commentary connects episodes.

For A: Very good of kind. For Y: Doubtful. For C: No.

Thunder Afloat

(Beery, Morris) (MGM) Beery as heavy-drinking, hard-hitting, bull-headed sea skipper joins navy for vengeance on German submarines. His insubordination and fearless heroics make comedy and thrill. Glorifies anti-German fighting spirit in World War.

For A: Very good of kind. For Y: Good of kind. For C: No.

Torpedoed

(H. B. Warner, Noah Beery, John Cromwell) (English) Lumbering story, confused by dizzy montage, of Britain's suppression of South American war crisis. Incessant riots, shooting of civilians, clumsy bombardments. British navy furnished the Royal Oak for torpedo climax! The picture's only distinction.

For A: Dull. For Y: No. For C: No.

Dancing Co-Ed

(Lana Turner, R. Carlson) (MGM) More or less funny story of pretty vaudeville dancer planted in so-called college by Hollywood studio in "dancing co-ed" contest. Amateurish mixture of pseudo-college antics, elementary comedy, and usual swing music.

For A: Depends on taste. For Y: Doubtful value. For C: No.

Best Recent Family Films:

Star Maker	What a Life!
Wizard of Oz	Babes in Arms
The Under Pup	They Shall Have Music

Best Recent Films for Adults:

Four Feathers	The Old Maid
Golden Boy	The Rains Came
Beau Geste	Nurse Edith Cavell

Use the Acquaintance Subscription Coupon on page 1386 — 17 weeks for $1.00

Starting November 22

A Series of Articles You Will Never Forget

PREACHERS PRESENT ARMS

By Ray H. Abrams

THREE weeks ago, in discussing "Preaching in Wartime," HALFORD E. LUCCOCK said: "The preacher starts in this war era with a gift of Providence which he did not have in the last war. That is a mirror into which he can look—and pray. That mirror is Ray Abrams' book, *Preachers Present Arms*. That book ought to have a place on our desks beside the Bible."

Is *Preachers Present Arms* one of the books you have always meant to read, but never have read? Is it so long since you read it that you have forgotten what it tells about what went on in the Christian churches of America during the First World War? Are you one of the thousands who would like to read it now? Then this coming series of articles is meant for you!

To put the essential parts of Prof. Abrams' famous book at the disposal of its readers *now*, The Christian Century has arranged with the author and the book's publisher (The Round Table Press) to present the heart of *Preachers Present Arms* in six installments starting with the issue of November 22.

In Six Memorable Installments

I. *Europe Starts a War and America Prepares.*
II. *The Holy War.*
III. *The Church as Servant of the State.*
IV. *The Churches Contribute to Wartime Hysteria.*
V. *The Churches and Free Speech.*
VI. *What Happened to the Conscientious Objectors.*

Be Sure Your Friends Read It, Too

Let Not Your Heart Be Troubled

By JAMES D. MORRISON

This attractive booklet, with appealing blue cover and beautifully printed pages, is designed for use in the ministry to the bereaved. Among the titles of the 30 readings—which include scripture, poems and prayers—are: "Love Can Never Lose Its Own," "I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes," "The Afterglow of a Good Life" and "The Master's Sympathy."

The price of the book makes it possible for ministers to have a number of copies on hand to be used as gifts for the bereaved in their congregations.

Cloth 40 cents.
Leather $1.00

'Luccock, Patton and Palmer rolled into one' is the way Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Editor of The *Christian Century Pulpit,* describes the new book

Highland Shepherds

By ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT

The author—already widely known for his *Steeples Among the Hills*—is thus characterized by Dr. Morrison: "He has the soundest judgment of preacher situations, the most delicate insight into the human nature of lay folk, the most devastatingly gentle power of showing up preachers' foibles, and the clearest idea about the relation of preaching to the pastoral function of any writer whose work has fallen into my hands."

But this book is not only for the rural minister, Dr. Morrison insists: "If Dr. Fosdick or Dr. Tittle or Dr. Truett should ask me to name the one book on the Christian ministry which he personally for his soul's good ought to read, I would name *Highland Shepherds.*"

(254 pages) $2.00

Vesper Dramas

By MARCUS BACH

Mr. Bach, prize-winning writer of plays, here brings his dramatic art to the service of religion. Ten dramas, brief and calling for small casts and minimum scenery, suitable for vesper presentation or at regular church or school services. William H. Leach, editor of *Church Management,* provides worship programs. Plays for Christmas, Easter, Memorial Day, etc.

One reason for the popularity of this new book of dramas is the fact that *no royalty* is charged for their production.

$2.50

'In the name of Christianity the challenge is accepted and religion can and will do something about it,'

says JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP as he reviews in *Christendom*

Revolutionary Christianity

By SHERWOOD EDDY

"In the midst of conflicting ideologies that absorb the thought and determine the action of the present-day world, has Christianity significance and can it contribute to an ultimate outcome of human well-being?" asks Dr. Lathrop, and he suggests that Eddy's new book will be of peculiar importance to all who are concerned. ". . . My parallel reading at the time happened to be Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath.* I felt like tossing my hat in the air when I went from one book to the other. In the name of Christianity the challenge is accepted and religion can and will do something about it."

A book for a world that is in revolution!

$2.00

Towards a True Orthodoxy—

The Case for Evangelical Modernism

By C. J. CADOUX

"Dr. Cadoux is aware that 'modernism' has been severely condemned by some contemporary theologians who would restore unwavering faith in the authority of the past. Against this perversity, he insists that the only way to attain correct—that is, 'orthodox'—religious beliefs is for the individual to apply in this sphere of interest the same processes of critical research and close reasoning that characterize students in the field of the modern sciences. . . .

"In reality, the Christianity that may properly claim to be orthodox is that which repeats itself from age to age under new conditions and with continually developing insights true to the spirit that marked the career of Jesus. This is 'evangelical modernism.'"—*Shirley J. Case* in *New York Herald-Tribune.*

$2.00

At your bookseller's or from the publishers

Willett, Clark & Company • 440 S. DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO

These Critical Days Demand
Intelligent Christian Leadership

ARE YOU KEEPING UP YOUR STUDIES?

Preachers are under a heavy burden as they confront the world's crying need for competent interpretation. How shall the preachers themselves keep abreast of the task?

There are no more successful teachers of preachers in all the Church than these Instructors in the revised

Graduate Courses of Study

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
Edgar S. Brightman

THE GOSPEL FOR ALL THE NATIONS
Oscar M. Buck

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT
W. G. Chanter

THE RELIGIOUS MESSAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
Clarence T. Craig

THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS
John Newton Davies

HOMILETICS
Albert E. Day

MODERN THOUGHT IN ITS BEARING ON RELIGION
Lisgar R. Eckardt

THE CHRISTIAN CRITICISM OF LIFE
Lynn Harold Hough

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER
F. Ernest Johnson

WORSHIP VALUES IN THE PSALMS
Elmer A. Leslie

THE EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN FAITH
Edwin Lewis

THE MINISTER'S LEADERSHIP IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
Frank M. McKibben

STUDIES IN JOHN'S GOSPEL
Chester Warren Quimby

THE MEANING OF GOD
Harris Franklin Rall

CHRISTIANITY AND NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS
Edmund D. Soper

THE MAKERS OF AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY
William W. Sweet

THE RELIGION AND THEOLOGY OF PAUL
Godfrey Tietze

JEREMIAH, THE MAN AND THE BOOK
Clyde E. Wildman

The Enrollment Fee for Each Course Is Two Dollars

For further information address

COMMISSION ON COURSES OF STUDY

ALLAN MacROSSIE, Executive Secretary
150 Fifth Avenue, New York City